| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Richard Drury |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); CPC.SF.Housing.Choice; CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA; Shum, Ryan (CPC) |
| **Cc:** | Lori Brooke |
| **Subject:** | Re: Family Zoning Plan Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985 |
| **Date:** | Friday, December 5, 2025 4:35:14 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.12.05.SF Rezone supplemental w-Holley.pdf |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:
Attached please find the supplemental comments of Neighborhoods United SF concerning the San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan." This is scheduled to be considered for second reading at the Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2025. Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985. Thank you for considering our comments, and please include these comments in the record for this matter.
Richard Drury

--
Richard Drury
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 836-4200
richard@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL

December 5, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Land Use and Transportation Committee c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, CPC, cpc.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org; ryan.shum@sfgov.org

**RE: Comment on CEQA Addendum for San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan."**
**Board of Supervisors December 9, 2025 (Second Reading).**
**Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985**

President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing on behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, a consortium of San Francisco neighborhood and community groups representing thousands of San Francisco residents, concerning the so-called San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan" ("Rezone"). This letter supplements our filings of December 1 and 2 in which we requested that the Board defer any decision on the Rezone until the City Planning Department prepares a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"). We attach hereto the amended comments of urban planner Deborah Holley, AICP. We urge the City to prepare a SEIR to consider feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Rezone's impacts and to consider feasible alternatives. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

December 1, 2025

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

**RE: Adequacy of the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR Addendum**

Dear Mr. Drury,

The San Francisco Planning Department published an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2022 Housing Element ("Housing Element FEIR") on September 3, 2025, stating that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review was required for the Family Housing Rezoning Program ("proposed rezoning program, Family Zoning Plan, FZP, rezoning plan").

Because there are potential new or more severe environmental impacts that would result from the proposed rezoning program that were not identified and analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, a supplemental EIR should have been prepared instead of an Addendum.

Such impacts include, but are not limited to the following:

A. The rezoning plan would result in new impacts associated with the potential redevelopment of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility which was not included and therefore not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR but which, as a result of the rezoning plan, is now designated as a site for the development of housing.

B. The rezoning plan would result in more severe displacement impacts, particularly those associated with the addition of numerous parcels within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD that were added to the rezoning plan but not included, and therefore not analyzed, in the Housing Element FEIR.

My qualifications for preparing this analysis include over 25 years of professional experience in land use and environmental planning, including the management and preparation of CEQA documents, and a Master of Science degree in Urban Planning

from Columbia University. My resume can be accessed via this link: https://www.holleyconsulting.com/resume/.

The Addendum to the Housing Element FEIR maintains that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required for the proposed rezoning program because the environmental impacts were adequately identified and analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, and the rezoning program "…would not result in any new or more severe environmental impacts than were identified previously."

Specifically, the Addendum states that "…no additional environmental review is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guideline Sections 15162-15164 for the following reasons:

(1) the Family Housing Rezoning Program would not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Housing Element EIR;
(2) no substantial changes have occurred that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Housing Element EIR; and
(3) no new information of substantial importance has become available which would indicate that (i) the Family Housing Rezoning Program will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR; (ii) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible, or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Housing Element EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment."

**2022 FEIR compared to Proposed Rezoning**

***Baseline Map***. In order to understand what was analyzed in the 2022 FEIR, and what was added in subsequent policy changes, I reconstructed "Figure 2-7 Projected Heights and Density Controls Under the Proposed Action" from page 2-25 of Vol. 1 of the FEIR. ***Figure 1***, below, provides the most detailed description of the parcel-level impacts of the proposed rezoning for parcels analyzed in the 2022 Final EIR.




**Figure 1. Baseline Map: 2022 FER Map Compared to the September 2025 Map, plus removing 3-unit+ Rent-Controlled Buildings and Hotels**

The September 2025 map, based on the rezoning legislation introduced in board file 250700, was the most recent parcel-level map released by the Planning Department. The most significant amendments passed include exempting rent-controlled buildings of three units or larger from the local program, and exempting hotel parcels. *Planning recently released a November 17th map but it is not accurate as it does not yet exclude three-units+ rent controlled buildings.*

***Figure 2*** below shows that 6,938 new parcels were added in the proposed rezoning plan, 7,580 parcels have increased heights, and 16,135 parcels allow for greater densities. Associated unit counts were also estimated and are provided in the table following Figure 2.




**Figure 2. Parcels added and parcels with increased heights and densities under the rezoning**

1. **What was added to the Family Zoning Plan from the FEIR?**

| What was added | Added by FZP | Current Unit Count |
|---|---|---|
| New Parcels | 6,938 parcels | 12,150 units |
| Increased Height Parcels | 7,580 parcels | 10,009 units |
| Increased Density Parcels | 16,135 parcels | 16,135 units |
| **Total Unanalyzed Parcels** | **30,653 parcels** | **38,692 units impacted** |

**2) Scope of Family Zoning Plan vs. 2022 Final EIR**

| Total Count | Final EIR - 2022 | Family Zoning Plan - 2025 |
|---|---|---|
| Parcel Count | 82,834 | 79,932 |
| Current Units Count* | 150,031 | 94,281 |
| Area Added (sq ft) | 257,461,954 | 254,211,574 |

** Residential and non-residential "units" (commercial spaces) impacted*

3. **Existing Parcels with increased height limits**

**a.** **7,580 parcels** with increased height limits
**b.** **10,009 currently existing units** in parcels with increased height limits
**c.** **31,424,690 sq ft** of total lot area in parcels with increased height limits

| Height Limit Increase | Parcels | Current Unit Count |
|---|---|---|
| 100' + | 73 | 201 |
| 60' - 100' | 34 | 31 |
| 40' - 60' | 667 | 823 |
| 20' - 40' | 3,244 | 4,906 |
| < 20' | 3,562 | 4,048 |

The following discussion describes potential impacts that were not analyzed in the CEQA document for the rezoning project. The Addendum is inadequate under CEQA and a supplemental EIR must be prepared to identify and analyze the potentially new and more severe impacts described below.

**A. Rezoning of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility**

There are new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed rezoning plan that were not identified and assessed in the Housing Element EIR or Addendum including impacts associated with development of the North Point Wet Weather Facility located at Bay Street and the Embarcadero. This City-owned and -operated sewage treatment plant is one of three facilities in San Francisco that treats wastewater. It is only active during wet weather and treats up to 150 million gallons a day (MGD) during rainstorms, or 26 percent of the wastewater treated on a rainy day.

The 2022 FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of this treatment plant with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning at that time. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' to 85' and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional.

There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development at this location. Since it is inconceivable that a developer would build housing on top of a sewage treatment plant, the City needs to analyze the impacts associated with elimination of the sewage treatment plant.

Moreover, although the Addendum states that "It is likely that the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would experience reduced pollutant loads under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element because housing growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would be more evenly distributed in the western and northern parts of the city and along transit corridors, instead of heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts as assumed under the adopted housing element; thus pollutant load generation, would be more evenly distributed throughout the city rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city," there is no mention at all of the North Point treatment plant. (See pages 127-128 of the Addendum.)

Potentially significant impacts that should have been identified and analyzed in a supplemental EIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Elimination of the sewage treatment plant would result in reduced sewage treatment capacity during wet weather. This would require (a) the construction of a new sewage treatment facility in this area of the city, or (b) the construction of new infrastructure to convey wastewater from the northeast quadrant of the city to the Oceanside Treatment Plant or the Southeast Treatment Plant in Bayview/Hunters Point and expansion of one of these facilities to expand the treatment capacity by 150 MGD to compensate for the loss of the North Point facility.

2. The potential public health and hazardous materials impacts of redeveloping the site with housing must be identified and analyzed and mitigation measures must be identified in a supplemental EIR. This includes but would not be limited to

testing and classification of contaminants, calculations of health risk, specific remediation measures, associated secondary impacts due to the excavation of contaminated soil, transportation and disposal of infrastructure, and treatment and disposal of contaminated water and soil.

**B. More severe displacement Impacts would result from the proposed rezoning program than were assumed in the Housing Element FEIR**

Potentially significant displacement impacts that should have been identified and analyzed in a supplemental EIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. ***Rezoning and displacement of tenants in two-unit rent-controlled buildings***. As shown below, under the proposed rezoning, there are a significant number of two-unit rent-controlled buildings on parcels with an existing height limit of 40 feet that would be rezoned to allow heights of 50', 65' and 85', and would no longer require setbacks, creating greater incentives and likelihood that they would be redeveloped under the proposed rezoning. In other words, it is reasonably foreseeable that they would be redeveloped and therefore should have been considered in the CEQA review for the project.

**<u>Rent Controlled Parcels</u>**

| What was added | Parcels affected | Existing units affected |
|---|---|---|
| New Parcels | 1,237 parcels | 2,474 units |
| Increased Height Parcels | 1,818 parcels | 3,636 units |
| Increased Density Parcels | 783 parcels | 1,566 units |
| Total Rent Controlled Parcels | 3,838 parcels | 7,676 units |

It is widely accepted that tenants of two-unit rent-controlled buildings already have fewer protections than tenants who live in buildings with three or more units because a two-unit building can more easily be converted into condos. In two-unit buildings, all an owner needs to do is move in, and they can evict a tenant to do so.

The inclusion of parcels with two-unit rent controlled buildings in the rezoning plan and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR.

2. ***Rezoning and displacement in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District.*** Section 249.97 (b) of the San Francisco Planning Code states that "The Priority Equity Geographies SUD is comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations" and that the 2022 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan ((2022 Housing Element) identifies them as "***areas***…***where zoning changes must be tailored to serve the specific needs of the communities that live there; and where programs that stabilize communities and meet community needs need to be prioritized***."

   As shown in ***Figure 2*** above and quantified below, close to 1,000 parcels in the proposed rezoning program that were not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR are located within the PEG SUD. Displacement impacts for residents in these areas are more severe than for residents outside of the SUD.

   **New Priority Equity Geography Parcels**
   a. 939 parcels
   b. 2,321 current existing units (including RC and non-RC)
   c. 70 two-unit RC buildings, 140 units

   The inclusion of parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR.

3. ***Rezoning and displacement of Laguna Hospital and Rehabilitation Center occupants***. As shown in ***Figure, 2*** above, the 62-acre Laguna Honda hospital and rehabilitation center located 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard was added to the rezoning plan, and if redeveloped would result in significant displacement impacts for the long-term nursing home residents.

   Laguna Honda has 769 beds and offers short-term rehab and long-term nursing care. in the Forest Hill neighborhood of San Francisco.

   The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' which covers the majority of the 62 acres under existing height limits, to 85' for the entire site, and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional.

There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development there.

Because the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center was not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, a supplemental EIR is needed to determine the impacts and required mitigation measures.

Sincerely,

Deborah E. Holley

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 3 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, and 251072 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, December 4, 2025 12:06:04 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 3 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, and 251072.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 3 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathy Howard |
| **To:** | DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrilStaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); WongStaff (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | You vote on the "Family" Zoning plan does not meet the needs of San Franciscans. |
| **Date:** | Thursday, December 4, 2025 11:00:41 AM |

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

Dear Supervisors who voted to approve the Mayor Rich Family Zoning Plan,

Please rethink your vote. There are so many problems with this plan! See my email below. Please stand up for San Franciscans!
Please vote NO next week and make these changes.

Katherine Howard
Sunset District

---

**From:** kh <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>
**Date:** Monday, December 1, 2025 at 9:11 PM
**To:** Supervisor Connie Chan <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>, <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>, <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>, <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>, <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>, Rafael Mandelman <MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org>, <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>, <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>, Shamann Walton <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, <SherrilStaff@sfgov.org>, A Clerk of the Board <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** <sean.mcgarry@sfgov.org>, <amy.campbell@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, <derek.braun@sfgov.org>, <lydia.so@sfgov.org>, <gilbert.a.williams@sfgov.org>, Jonas Ionin <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** BOS: Postpone vote on the 'Family' Zoning plan.

Dear Supervisors,

The entire City voted on District 4's Great Highway, but once again **District 4**, through no fault of our own, **has NO voice in the upzoning legislation**. This is despite the fact that the upzoning legislation could result in bulldozing our entire neighborhood. We have had a new Supervisor all of one day and no easy way to contact him. He has not had time to hold neighborhood meetings; he has not had the opportunity to find out what his district thinks.

You should **postpone this vote** until we have had the opportunity to meet with our new Supervisor. *We are tired of being ignored*.

As to the legislation, many changes must be made:

- **Eliminate in-lieu fees**. In-lieu fees delay affordable housing and create exclusive enclaves of luxury housing.
- **Dedicate all suitable public land – excluding parks and public open space - to 100% affordable housing.**
- **Preserve the Coastal Zone as it is today.**
- **Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.** It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation.
- **Repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system**.
- **Protect historic and culturally significant buildings, districts and open space.** All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings, districts, and open space** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.
- **Prevent height increases near parks and schools.** Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character of our district that the City claims to value.
- **Install the emergency firefighting system before more density is built, or a major quake and the ocean winds could result in an unstoppable fire that will run from west to east over all of San Francisco.**

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

District 4

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stephen Torres |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 3:12:11 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.12.02.pdf.pdf |

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

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please see my attached letter regarding items 35-38 in today's agenda.

Best,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission District
San Francisco, California

December 2, 2025

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Legislative Chamber, City Hall
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing today to implore you again not to pass the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. Far from an actual plan, it continues to lack the protections and guidance that should be in a plan for our City's future. Vital amendments that could have mitigated the egregious gaps have been rejected and instead this gives over our control wholesale to developers and private equity with very little in regulation and oversight.

Many of you have held that we can do nothing because our hands are being tied by the state or that we cannot stand in the way of progress. I would like to remind you that you were elected to challenge anything that may negatively impact our communities and to guide community determination over our future, not to acquiesce or remain passive. At a time when power is being consolidated to the most wealthy and private interests at every level of government, voting yes on this plan would send a troubling and dangerous signal to San Franciscans as well as Californians when they should have the most confidence in those who represent them closest to home.

Please vote no on this legislation and work for a more representative and integrative plan for all San Franciscans and challenge any mandate from Sacramento or anywhere that removes our City's voice and determination.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | D7 Youth Council |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Low, Jen (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Letter of Support - File No. 250700 and File No. 250701 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 1:21:15 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Letter from D7 Youth Council.pdf |

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please find attached a letter from the District 7 Youth Council for File No 250700 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] and File No. 250701 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan].

Thank you.

November 18, 2025

District 7 Youth Council
d7youthcouncil@gmail.com

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of the District 7 Youth Council, we would like to express our support for the Family Zoning Plan. The District 7 Youth Council is a body of 15 youths who live or attend school in District 7. Created by former Supervisor Norman Yee, the District 7 Youth Council looks to provide the District 7 Supervisor with guidance on youth issues. Additionally, it works to improve the conditions for youth across District 7.

We all know it's vital to increase housing across the city. However, as a Youth Council representing San Francisco's youth, we especially recognize the importance of prioritizing increasing density around schools and transit corridors. This is crucial for a number of reasons, but above all, it would reduce commuting times for students and traffic on the street. Public transit thrives with more riders, neighborhood small businesses thrive with more neighbors, and local public schools thrive with more kids.

We would also like to express our support for facilitating 2-4-bedroom housing units to incentivize families to stay and thrive in San Francisco. Currently, developers often find smaller studio and one-bedroom units more financially viable, which makes it difficult for families with children to find appropriate housing in San Francisco. Offering density bonuses and implementing zoning modifications as incentives for developers to build 2-4-bedroom units creates financial incentives that align developers' interests and San Francisco's need for family housing. We support Supervisor Melgar's amendment to exempt buildings with three or more rent-controlled apartments from upzoning. This protection for approximately 84,000 rental units balances both safeguarding existing tenants and affordable housing, while still allowing the development necessary to address the city's housing crisis.

We recognize that development may impact local businesses, and we strongly support funds for small business relocation. We encourage creative solutions like Supervisor Melgar's small business construction relief fund, as well as community donations and fundraisers, to help small businesses relocate and continue serving our neighborhoods. Additionally, we need to prioritize finding affordable family housing strategies and implementing strong tenant protections to ensure that existing residents aren't displaced as we work to create more housing opportunities.

As young citizens of San Francisco, we want to be able to continue to live in our beautiful city. For that reason, the D7 Youth Council, on behalf of youth around the city, supports the family zoning plan.

Sincerely,
Sophia Shen, Andrew Martinovsky, Nicole Lee, Edward Naser, Konrad Kruszka
Housing & Transportation Committee, District 7 Youth Council

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bullock, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 7 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, and 251072 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 12:10:14 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 7 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, and 251072.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 7 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Operations |
| **Subject:** | Fw: San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (SFENDC) Support for Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 9:57:18 AM |

---

Get Outlook for iOS

---

**From:** Bruce Agid <bruce.h.agid@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 2, 2025 9:02 AM
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Alan.Wong1@sfgov.org <Alan.Wong1@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Meaghan Mitchell <Meaghanmitchell@gmail.com>; Tyra Fennell <tyrafennellsf@gmail.com>; Sean Karlin <sean.karlin@gmail.com>; Amerika Sanchez <amerikasanchez@gmail.com>; Charley Goss <charlesbgoss@gmail.com>; Derek Lee <derekjlee27@gmail.com>; Kurt Grimes <kurtb.grimes@gmail.com>; Chris Chang <chriskchang@gmail.com>; Maika Pinkston <maikapinkston@gmail.com>; Latoya Pitcher <ltpitcher@gmail.com>; Spencer Lam <spencerl1296@gmail.com>; Eric Dew <edew@theizegroup.com>; Mark Malouf <mmalouf@teamsters665.org>; Alan Tsui <alant2k@yahoo.com>; Rachael Tanner <r.ann.tanner@gmail.com>; Gary Pegueros <garypegueros@sbcglobal.net>; Chanel Blackwell <chanelblackwell1@gmail.com>; Elijah Ball <elijahiball@gmail.com>; Courtney Sid <courtneysid@gmail.com>; sliubettencourt@gmail.com <sliubettencourt@gmail.com>; JiLon Li <jilonli@gmail.com>; Rupali Singhal <rupa9988@gmail.com>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Cooper, Raynell (BOS) <raynell.cooper@sfgov.org>; Sciammas, Charlie (BOS) <charlie.sciammas@sfgov.org>; Ho, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.ho@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Mathew Castillon <mcastillon10@gmail.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (MYR) <han.zou@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (SFENDC) Support for Mayor

Lurie's Family Zoning Plan

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

December 2, 2025

RE: Support Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Board of the Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (ENDC) supports the passage and adoption of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

This proposal plans to build more housing for San Franciscans while ensuring we can control our own destiny by maintaining local land use controls. Without the Family Zoning Plan, San Francisco will face the Builder's Remedy as well as fines and loss of ~$100 million in funding for transit and housing. Furthermore, this plan incentivizes family-sized homes of at least two, three, or more bedrooms. These types of homes help more families stay in San Francisco.

The plan aligns with ENDC's Mission & Vision. The San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (ENDC) was established by residents of San Francisco's Supervisorial Districts 3, 6, and 10 to organize voters and provide a discussion and educational forum to address the most pressing issues facing the eastern neighborhoods of our City.

The ENDC provides a Democratic political voice to advocate an urbanist-equity platform (a focus on creating complete communities) with twin goals of keeping current residents and families in San Francisco while welcoming newcomers. The Family Zoning Plan aligns firmly with these values.

We are proud to support the Family Zoning Plan, which incorporates many important accepted amendments, and urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt the plan without delay.

Thanks in advance,

Bruce Agid
President, ENDC on behalf of the Board of ENDC

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Richard Drury |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); CPC.SF.Housing.Choice; CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA; Shum, Ryan (CPC) |
| **Cc:** | Lori Brooke |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 9:02:54 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.12.02.SF Rezone Supoplemental BOS ComLtr-PDF w Exhibit.pdf |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:
Attached please find the supplemental comments of Neighborhoods United SF concerning the San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan." Board of Supervisors December 2, 2025. Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985.
Thank you for considering our comments, and please include these comments in the record for this matter.
Richard Drury

--
Richard Drury
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 836-4200
richard@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL

December 2, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Land Use and Transportation Committee c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, CPC, cpc.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org; ryan.shum@sfgov.org

**RE: Comment on CEQA Addendum for San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan."**
**Board of Supervisors December 2, 2025.**
**Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985**

President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing on behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, a consortium of San Francisco neighborhood and community groups representing thousands of San Francisco residents, concerning the so-called San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan" ("Rezone"). This letter supplements our filing yesterday in which we requested that the Board defer any decision on the Rezone until the City Planning Department prepares a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR").

We attach hereto the shadow "heat map" prepared by Adam Noble of FastCast showing that the Rezone will have dramatic shadow impacts on Joe DiMaggio Park. This is a zero-tolerance park under the City's Prop M (Planning Code Section 295). This is a new significant impact of the Rezone that must be analyzed in an SEIR, along with the

impacts discussed in yesterday's letter. We urge the City to prepare a SEIR to consider feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Rezone's impacts, and also to consider feasible alternatives, such as placing the proposed 4,000 additional units in specific locations, rather than upzoning entire swaths of the city in hopes that the 4,000 units will be built somewhere within the upzoned areas. We do not need to destroy the City to save it. Instead, the necessary new development can be place in areas of the City where it will not destroy rent-controlled housing and where it will not destroy functional, urban communities.

Sincerely,



Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

EXHIBIT B




## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Full Year Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

| | |
|---|---|
| Under 2 min/day | (under 13 hrs/year) |
| 2 - 4 min/day | (13 - 25 hrs/year) |
| 4 - 8 min/day | (25 - 49 hrs/year) |
| 8 - 16 min/day | (49 - 98 hrs/year) |
| 16 - 32 min/day | (98 - 195 hrs/year) |
| 32 - 64 min/day | (195 - 390 hrs/year) |
| 64 - 128 min/day | (390 - 779 hrs/year) |
| Over 128 min/day | (over 779 hrs/year) |

# FULL YEAR

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

Joe DiMaggio Playground*

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

40’

50’

65’

Shadow Fan is cropped to park boundaries

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JUNE 21

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JUNE 28

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 5

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 12

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 19

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 26

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 2

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 9

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 16

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 23

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 30

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 6

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 13

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 20

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 27

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 4

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 11

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 18

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 25

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 1

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 8

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 15

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 22

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 29

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# DECEMBER 6

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# DECEMBER 13

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# DECEMBER 20

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathryn Hyde |
| **To:** | Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov |
| **Subject:** | Re: housing SF |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 6:51:15 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind

- Much of the new construction is poorly designed - i,e, Haight and Stanyan

- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like cities that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

I favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathy Howard |
| **To:** | ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrilStaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | BOS: Postpone vote on the "Family" Zoning plan. |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 9:11:37 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The entire City voted on District 4's Great Highway, but once again **District 4**, through no fault of our own, **has NO voice in the upzoning legislation**. This is despite the fact that the upzoning legislation could result in bulldozing our entire neighborhood. We have had a new Supervisor all of one day and no easy way to contact him. He has not had time to hold neighborhood meetings; he has not had the opportunity to find out what his district thinks.

You should **postpone this vote** until we have had the opportunity to meet with our new Supervisor. *We are tired of being ignored*.

As to the legislation, many changes must be made:

- **Eliminate in-lieu fees**. In-lieu fees delay affordable housing and create exclusive enclaves of luxury housing.
- **Dedicate all suitable public land – excluding parks and public open space - to 100% affordable housing.**
- **Preserve the Coastal Zone as it is today.**
- **Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.** It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation.
- **Repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system**.
- **Protect historic and culturally significant buildings, districts and open space.** All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings, districts, and open space** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.
- **Prevent height increases near parks and schools.** Casting shadows on open spaces

and classrooms undermines the very “well-resourced” character of our district that the City claims to value.

- **Install the emergency firefighting system before more density is built, or a major quake and the ocean winds could result in an unstoppable fire that will run from west to east over all of San Francisco.**

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

District 4

**From:** deejoyce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marie D. Joyce
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, December 1, 2025 9:37:39 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Board of Supervisors now faces a Tuesday, 12/2 vote on the most massive zoning changes in San Francisco history. Yet without hearing a single public comment, less than a dozen people could allow sweeping redevelopment along our parks, beaches, waterfronts and thriving commercial corridors. Even more incredulously, one of those supervisors was just appointed today.

A proposal of this magnitude should go before voters on a citywide ballot. Back in 2013, voters resoundingly rejected a proposed "Wall on the Waterfront," which was merely one luxury project on the Embarcadero. But under the "Family Zoning Plan," huge swaths of our northern and western neighborhoods are now targeted - mainly for their potential high-rise iconic views. And this development can only be accomplished with a wrecking ball, which will also displace beloved small businesses and tenant neighbors.

As a 20-year San Francisco resident, I urge you to:.

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Marie D. Joyce
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Richard Drury |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org |
| **Subject:** | CEQA comments for Family Zoning Plan (Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985) |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 12:44:59 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.12.01.SF Rezone BOS ComLtr-PDF w exhibits.pdf |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors and Land Use and Transportation Committee:
Attached please find the comments of Neighbors United SF concerning the Family Zoning Plan, (Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985).
Thank you for considering these comments. Please include these comments in the record for this matter.
Richard Drury

--
Richard Drury
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 836-4200
richard@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL

December 1, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Land Use and Transportation Committee c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, CPC, FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org

**RE: Comment on CEQA Addendum for San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan."**
**Board of Supervisors December 2, 2025.**
**Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985**

President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing on behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, a consortium of San Francisco neighborhood and community groups representing thousands of San Francisco residents, concerning the so-called San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan" ("Rezone"). We request that the Board defer any decision on the Rezone until the City Planning Department prepares a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"). CEQA review would force the City to consider feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Rezone's impacts, and also to consider feasible alternatives, such as placing the proposed 4,000 additional units in specific locations (such as Park Merced, Stonestown, Treasure Island, Hunters Point, etc.), rather than upzoning entire swaths of the city in hopes that the 4,000 units will be built somewhere within the upzoned areas.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Rezone will forever change the face of the City. It will allow new development to accommodate 54,000 new housing units in so-called "well-resourced" areas of the City.[1] While the City prepared an environmental impact report ("EIR") for its Housing Element in 2022 (2022 EIR), the proposed Rezone is vastly different from the zoning studied in the 2022 Housing Element and its associated 2022 EIR. Nevertheless, the Planning Department proposes to rely on the 2022 EIR.

A rezoning of this magnitude requires thorough environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") so that the City's residents and decision-makers can be aware of its impacts, can consider all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, and can have a robust and open discussion prior to making irreversible changes to San Francisco's landscape for all time. The California Court of Appeal recently held that a supplemental EIR ("SEIR") is required for a general plan amendment that allows taller buildings than allowed by a prior plan (as here), and that the SEIR must analyze all of the increased impacts caused by the taller buildings. (*Save Our Access v. City of San Diego*, 2025 WL 2945714, 115 Cal.App.5th 388 (Cal. Ct. App. Oct. 17, 2025) (*Save Our Access II*); *Save Our Access v. City of San Diego*, 92 Cal.App.5th 819 (2023) (*Save Our Access I*).) Under the *Save Our Access* line of cases, an SEIR is clearly required for the Rezone since it allows vastly taller building heights, and includes different geographic areas than the 2022 Plan.

The Rezone will have myriad significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR or included in the Housing Element.

- HISTORIC RESOURCES: The Rezone, unlike the Housing Element, will allow new, high-rise development in the historic northeast neighborhoods of North Beach and the Northern Waterfront, including Fisherman's Wharf– something not allowed or analyzed the 2022 EIR or Housing Element.
- HEIGHT LIMITS INCREASED: The Rezone, unlike the Housing Element, includes amendments to base zoning and base height limits, and creating new zoning for many areas. The Rezone will allow the construction of buildings up to 350-feet taller than anything analyzed in the 2022 EIR, resulting in new wind, aesthetic, biological and shadow impacts not analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

---

[1] While the Rezone purports to address racial disparities in the City by targeting "well-resourced" areas, the Rezone seems to focus on largely Asian "well-resourced" areas, such as the Sunset District, Richmond District, and Northeast, while leaving largely untouched predominantly Caucasian "well-resourced" area such as Pacific Heights, Marina and Seacliff. As such, the Rezone may have discriminatory impacts, much like the development of the Western Addition, or the City's historic bans on wood-framed buildings that targeted Chinese-owned businesses. (See, *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 6 S. Ct. 1064, 1065, 30 L. Ed. 220 (1886).) The City should analyze the potentially racially discriminatory impacts of the Rezone.

- HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT: The Rezone, unlike the Housing Element, establishes a housing sustainability district.
- WIND: The Rezone will create significant new wind impacts from vastly taller buildings, while at the same time the Rezone ordinance proposes to weaken the City's wind ordinance to eliminate the requirement for mandatory wind mitigation, and to redefine significant wind impacts from 1-hour to 9-hours – all of which will conspire to create significant new wind impacts far greater than anything analyzed or contemplated in the 2022 EIR.
- DISPLACEMENT OF RENT-CONTROLLED HOUSING: The Rezone will result in the displacement of rent-controlled tenants and legacy businesses, by replacing rent-controlled and existing affordable units with luxury, high-rise condos and allowing development in the areas within the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District – something avoided in the 2022 Housing Element.
- AIR POLLUTION: The Rezone will create significant airborne cancer risks in newly identified APEZ zones (air pollutant exposure zones), and will result in criteria air pollution far above CEQA significance threshold set by the Bay Area Air District .
- SHADOW: The Rezone will create significant new shadow impacts due to much taller buildings.
- CONTAMINATED SITES: The Rezone will allow development on contaminated sites not analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- TRAFFIC: The Rezone will create new significant air quality impacts from increased vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and from construction emissions.
- SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT: The Rezone will allow development on the site of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility, which will require either a replacement facility or vast amounts of infrastructure to transport sewage to other plants.
- NORTH BEACH SUD: The Rezone will have cumulative impacts with the recent repeal of the North Beach Special Use District, which removes protections for almost all historic resources in the North Beach area.
- GREAT HIGHWAY CLOSURE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The City has failed to analyze new changed circumstances, particularly the closure of the Great Highway, which will exacerbate significant traffic and public transit impacts on the Rezone, which adds thousands of new residential units to the Sunset and Richmond neighborhoods.

It is legally improper for the City to bypass CEQA review for the Rezone. Addenda are only allowed where '(2) Only **minor technical changes** or additions are necessary to make the EIR under consideration adequate under CEQA." (CEQA Guidelines §15164, subd. (a); *Save Our Heritage Organization v. City of San Diego*, 28

Cal. App. 5th 656, 664–65 (2018) (emphasis added). The Proposed Rezone in this case allows **increased height of up to 350-feet above those analyzed in the 2022 EIR**. (Addendum No. 1 to 2022 Housing Element Environmental Impact Report, ("Addendum") at p. 11). The 2022 EIR analyzed building heights of up to 300 feet for proposed buildings, which the Rezone allows building heights of up to 500 to 650 feet – 350 feet taller than anything analyzed in the 2022 EIR. (Addendum 11). These are not "minor technical changes," but rather major substantive changes with significant environmental impacts.

For these reasons, we ask the City to prepare a Supplement EIR to analyze the Rezone, and to consider feasible mitigation measures and alternative to reduce its myriad impacts.

## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Rezone proposes to add 54,000 new housing units to San Francisco, above levels that would occur without rezoning. The City contends that the Rezone is necessary to meet state-mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals of 36,200 additional housing units. The 2022 Housing Element provided for 50,000 new units of housing, so the Rezone allows for significantly more housing – 4,000 additional units. The Rezone moves the proposed housing to different areas of the city where it will have far greater impacts to historic resources, air quality, transportation, displacement and other resources.

We are commenting on the version of the Rezone that has been provided to the public. However, we are aware that the Rezone is in a state of flux, as new amendments are being proposed on an almost daily basis. The Rezone is a moving target, which makes meaningful public comment all but impossible. "An accurate, stable and finite project description is the sine qua non of an informative and legally adequate EIR." (*County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles* (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 185, 192.) "[A] curtailed or distorted project description," on the other hand, "may stultify the objectives of the reporting process. Only through an accurate view of the project may affected outsiders and public decision-makers balance the proposal's benefit against its environmental costs, consider mitigation measures, assess the advantage of terminating the proposal (i.e., the "no project" alternative) and weigh other alternatives in the balance." (*Id.* See also, CEQA section 15124.) The City has abjectly failed to provide the public with an accurate and stable project description that would allow meaningful comment. At the very least, the City should allow a 30-day public comment period between the first reading of the Rezone Ordinance at the Board of Supervisors, anticipated to occur on December 2, 2025 and the second reading. The Project description will not be stable until the December 2, 2025 vote. This will allow a 30-day period for the public to review and comment on the stable project description.

The Project description in the 2022 EIR simply does not accurately describe the Rezone project. As such, the City may not rely on the 2022 EIR, which describes a very different Project. Some courts have allowed agencies to rely on prior EIRs when the revised project has the same footprint or the same or reduced environmental impacts.

(*Sw. Reg'l Council of Carpenters v. City of Los Angeles* (2022) 76 Cal. App. 5th 1154). However, when, as here, the project's footprint is expanded, the project's height is increased, and/or the project's impacts are increased, a supplemental EIR is required. (*Save Our Access I and II*).

The City largely ignores or mischaracterizes the Rezone's environmental impacts. For example, the Addendum does not even mention the fact that the Rezone (unlike the 2022 Housing Element) will allow redevelopment in the northeast districts of Telegraph Hill, North Beach and the Northern Waterfront, including Fisherman's Wharf. The City also ignores the fact that it has already approved 71,772 new units of housing that have yet to be built. The City' RHNA goal is 82,069. Therefore, the City only needs another 10,297 units to meet its RHNA goal – not 36,200, or 54,000.[2] Nor does the City discuss the fact that the Rezone is likely to displace low-income residents from rent-controlled units, while constructing new market-rate units without rent-control. The Rezone does not require any affordable housing and allows rent-controlled units to be replaced with luxury housing. The net result is likely to be less affordable housing – not more. The City's own calculations show that the Rezone will abjectly fail to meet RHNA's affordable housing goals.

The City fails to accurately describe the Rezone project. The City calculates that the "realistic" projected build-out as a result of the Rezone will be 54,000 additional housing units – 4,000 more than analyzed in the 2022 EIR. However, the Rezone actually creates a capacity for an additional 800,000 housing units. Full build-out would more than double the population of the City. Even the City's own calculations estimate that the Rezone could result in a range of additional housing ranging from 64,000 units (soft sites method); 39,000 units (citywide capacity method); to 19,000 units (financial feasibility method). (SF Planning Dept., Family Zoning Plan Rezoning Capacity Calculations Fact Sheet). Since the City's own staff admits that these are all realistic scenarios, a CEQA document should be prepared to compare the environmental impacts of these feasible outcomes, as well as the full build-out scenario.

The Rezone is vastly different from the Housing Element analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Supplemental CEQA review is required to analyze the impacts created by these vast changes to the Housing Element. These major modifications are discussed in the attached letter from Certified Urban Planner, Deborah Holley. (Exhibit A). Ms. Holley provides a map showing that the Rezone adds massive amounts of new development to District 3 (North Beach, Fisherman's Warf), and District 8 (Mission/Noe Valley), none of which was even mentioned in the 2022 EIR.

- The 2025 Rezone adds 6,938 parcels and 12,150 units, that were not in the 2022 Housing Element.

---

[2] Housing and Community Development barely accounted for the capacity created by the 4-plex and 6-plex legislation passed in 2023. Roughly 120,000 parcels are eligible, and even a fraction of those converting to 4–6 units would generate hundreds of thousands of potential homes.

- The Rezone increases height on 7,580 parcels and 10,009 units, above heights analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- The Rezone increases density on 16,135 parcels, with 16,135 units currently on those parcels.
- The Rezone adds 30,653 parcels with 38,692 units that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR – mostly in District 3 and District 8.
- The Rezone almost doubles the square footage of developable land, increasing the amount by 254,211,574 square feet.

The Rezone opens up thousands of rent-controlled units for high density, market rate development, virtually ensuring that thousands of low-income residents will be displaced to make way for luxury housing. The Rezone includes 3,481 two-unit rent-controlled parcels with 32,237 units, increases height on 4,345 rent-controlled parcels with 26,784 units, an increases density on 1,341 rent-controlled parcels with 20,691 units. While the Board of Supervisors is considering amendments to protect rent-controlled units with 3 or more units, this leaves about 20,564 two-unit rent-controlled units (10,282 parcels) with absolutely no protection from displacement and redevelopment.

None of these impacts were proposed, discussed or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, and must be analyzed and mitigated in a supplemental EIR.

## III. LEGAL STANDARD.

### A. CEQA Addendum (Pub. Res. Code section 21166).

The City Planning Department proposes to approve the Rezone based on an Addendum to the 2022 Housing Element EIR. This is entirely inappropriate since, as discussed above, the Rezone adds 30,653 parcels that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The proposed Rezone is vastly different from the project analyzed in the 2022 EIR, and will have significant new environmental impacts that must be analyzed in a Supplemental EIR. (SEIR).

The court of appeal has stated, "The addendum is the other side of the coin from the supplement to an EIR. This section provides an interpretation with a label and an explanation of the kind of document that does not need additional public review." "It must be remembered that an addendum is prepared where '(2) **Only minor technical changes or additions are necessary to make the EIR under consideration adequate under CEQA; and (3) The changes to the EIR made by the addendum do not raise important new issues about the significant effects on the environment.**' (CEQA Guidelines §15164 (a); *Save Our Heritage Organization v. City of San Diego*, 28 Cal. App. 5th 656, 664–65 (2018) (emphasis added).) Even a 15-foot increase in height for a residential building (increasing height from 75 feet to 90 feet) requires a supplemental EIR, not an addendum. "Accordingly, the appropriate protocol is to have the county draft and recirculate a focused supplemental EIR, limited solely to analysis of height and profile-related impacts of the medical clinic, as built and where built to a height of ninety feet." *Ventura Foothills Neighbors v. Cty. of Ventura*, 232 Cal. App. 4th 429, 434, (2014).

Section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that "the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred." Pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration is only required when:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

    (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would, in fact, be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The "fair argument" standard applies to analysis under Section 21166 when the proposed project is outside the scope of the prior EIR. As the Court of Appeal recently held:

> We similarly apply the **fair argument** test to review an agency's determination whether to prepare a **new** or **supplemental EIR** in a later **new project** following certification of a **program EIR**. [Citation.] The Legislature's use of similar language in sections 21151 and 21094 indicate "it intended to establish a similar **low threshold** for an agency's determination **whether to prepare a new EIR** on a later new project that follows certification of a program or plan EIR. In other words, **if** there is **substantial evidence** in the record that the **later project may arguably have** a **significant adverse effect** on the environment

> which was **not examined in the prior program EIR, doubts must be resolved in favor of environmental review** and the agency **must prepare** a **new tiered EIR, notwithstanding** the existence of **contrary evidence**." [Citation.]
>
> (*Save Our Access I*, 92 Cal.App.5th at 860 [citing *Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1320–1321] [emph. added].)

As the court held in *Save Our Access I*, a project that allows development of a greater height than analyzed in a prior programmatic EIR, is outside the scope of the prior EIR. (*Save Our Access I*, 92 Cal.App.5th at 845.) Therefore, the "fair argument" standard applies to subsequent projects that exceed the height limits in the program EIR. (*Id*. at 860). A project that includes geographic areas outside the scope of the prior program EIR is also subject to the fair argument standard. (*Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1320–1321). A subsequent project is not within the scope of a previous Program EIR if it is inconsistent with the plan addressed in the Program EIR. (14 CCR § 15168(c)(2); *see* PRC § 21094(b).) "**If the subsequent project is not consistent with the program or plan, it is treated as a new project and must be fully analyzed in a project—or another tiered EIR if it may have a significant effect on the environment.**" (*Friends of College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist*. (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, 960 [emph. added]; *Save Our Access I,* 92 Cal.App.5th at 845.)

Since the Rezone allows vast swaths of development outside of geographic areas analyzed in the 2022 EIR, allows building heights of up to 350 taller than analyzed in the 2022 EIR, and allows development of historic resources and contaminated sites not analyzed in the 2022 EIR, the "fair argument" standard applies to the City's use of an Addendum. Under the fair argument standard, an EIR is required if there is a "fair argument" based on substantial evidence that the project may have any significant adverse environmental impacts. Pub. Res. Code § 21080(d).

**B. SB 131.**

The Addendum briefly argues that the recently passed SB 131 applies to some, but not all, of the Rezone. (Addendum 8). SB 131 exempts from CEQA review "a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 65583 of the Government Code." The City argues that this exemption applies to all but 3.4 percent of the parcels in the Rezone, which are excluded from SB 131 as "natural and protected lands." (Addendum 8).

The City misinterprets SB 131. First, the Rezone does not implement the approved 2022 Housing Element. In fact, the Rezone is flatly inconsistent with the 2022 Housing Element. Most obviously, the 2022 Housing Element included almost no new development in the historic Northeast sector of the city (800 units), while the Rezone allows 5,900 units in that area. (Addendum 19). The 2022 Housing Element provided for negative 1,800 units in Downtown, while the Rezone placed 500 units in the Downtown area. (Id.). The Rezone placed 2,800 additional units in the Western Addition. Also, the

Rezone allows construction of buildings up to 350 taller than allowed by the Housing Element. As discussed above, the Rezone adds 30,653 parcels that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Since the Rezone is inconsistent with the 2022 Housing Element, SB 131 does not apply at all.

Second, SB 131 provides that it does not apply to "natural and protected lands," and the Rezone admittedly includes numerous parcels that meet this definition. (Pub. Res. Code § 21080.085).

> (a) This division does not apply to a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 65583 of the Government Code.
> (b) (1) Subdivision (a) does not apply to either of the following:
> (B) A rezoning that would allow for construction to occur within the boundaries of any natural and protected lands as defined pursuant to Section 21067.5.
> (2) (A) (i) Subdivision (a) applies to a rezoning that contains within its boundaries any natural and protected lands as defined pursuant to Section 21067.5 if those natural and protected lands are excluded from the rezoning.
> (ii) The definition of "natural and protected lands" described in clause (i) does not include the lands described in subdivision (p) of Section 21067.5.
> (B) The rezoning of any parcel or portions of a parcel that is excluded from a rezoning under this paragraph shall be a separate project that is subject to this division.
>
> Public Resources Code §21067.5 defines "natural and protected land" as follows:
>
> "Natural and protected lands" means sites located within any of the following locations:
> (a) The state park system, as described in Article 1 (commencing with Section 5001) of Chapter 1 of Division 5.
> …
> (i) A hazardous waste site that is listed pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code or a hazardous waste site designated by the Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Section 25356 of the Health and Safety Code, unless either of the following apply:
> (1) The site is an underground storage tank site that received a uniform closure letter issued pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code based on closure criteria established by the State Water Resources Control Board for the use proposed by the project. This paragraph does not alter or change the conditions to remove a site from the list of hazardous waste sites listed pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
> (2) The State Department of Public Health, State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, or a local agency making a determination pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code has otherwise determined that the site is suitable for the use proposed by the project.

> (j) Within a regulatory floodway as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in any official maps published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, unless the development has received a no-rise certification in accordance with Section 60.3(d)(3) of Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
> …
> (m) An environmentally sensitive area within the coastal zone, as defined in Section 30107.5…

The Addendum admits that at least 3.4 percent of the Rezone area are "natural and protected lands," within the meaning of SB 131. The Upzoning Plan includes several Cortese List contaminated sites. Several of these sites are "active," meaning that they have not be remediated. We have retained a hazardous materials expert to identify all of the Cortese List sites covered by the Upzoning. But we have already identified at least nine active Cortese List sites in our informal review, including 1100 JUNIPERO SERRA BLVD; and 300 W PORTAL AVE. The Rezone also includes parcels in listed flood zones. The Rezone also includes environmentally sensitive areas in the Coastal zone. These areas are expressly excluded from SB 131 and render the entire Rezone project ineligible for an SB 131 exemption.[3]

## IV. CEQA ANALYSIS.

### A. HISTORIC RESOURCES.

The Rezone will have significant historic resources impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR found significant and unmitigated impacts to historic resources, (Addendum 60), but the Rezone's impacts are far greater and also significant and unmitigated. (Addendum 61). Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).)

---

[3] The Addendum suggests that it can review the Rezone using a hybrid approach – reviewing the natural and protected lands under CEQA section 21166, and the remainder of the Project under SB 131. However, CEQA prohibits such a schizophrenic analysis. Under CEQA, the agency must review the "whole of the action" in a single document. A "project" is "the whole of an action" directly undertaken, supported, or authorized by a public agency "which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable ***indirect*** physical change in the environment." (PRC § 21065; CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR § 15378(a).) A public agency is not permitted to subdivide a single project into smaller individual subprojects in order to avoid the responsibility of considering the environmental impact of the project as a whole. "The requirements of CEQA, 'cannot be avoided by chopping up proposed projects into bite-size pieces which, individually considered, might be found to have no significant effect on the environment or to be only ministerial.' [Citation.]" (*Topanga Beach Renters Assn.* v. *Department of General Services* (1976) 58 Cal.App.3d 188, 195-196 [129 Cal.Rptr. 739].)

We submit herewith the comments of Architectural Historian Bridget Maley, former President of the San Francisco Landmarks Advisory Board. (Exhibit B). She states:

> The Rezone would result in a myriad of significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR or included in the Housing Element, not the least of which are impacts to historic resources. The Rezone will have significant historic resources impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR found significant and unmitigated impacts to historic resources, but the Rezone's impacts are far greater, with significant and unmitigated impacts. Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).)
>
> The Rezone allows high-rise development on, near, or within areas that contain historic resources. Many of these areas were not included for development in the 2022 Housing Element, and the impacts of this potential development on historic resources was not analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
>
> Further, the Rezone includes the following language related to Bonuses for "Historic Preservation." However, these bonuses, as shown below, encourage height increases, facadism, and other over-scaled additions that would result in diminished historic fabric and result in unintended impacts to historic resources. Additionally, this proposed legislation added at the last minute in the September 11, 2025 version of the legislation, and has not been evaluated in the Addendum or in a SEIR.
>
> (Maley at 2-3).

Maley goes on to discuss provisions of the Rezone that encourage development of historic buildings. She states, "This late addition to the legislation has the great potential to cause impacts to historic resources, instead of preserving them, as it would allow large sections of historic buildings to be demolished and over scaled additions and height increases to be implemented as bonuses. For the reasons listed above, it is my professional opinion that the Rezone, if approved, would have potentially significant environmental impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") through a full recirculated SEIR." (Id. at 4).

The 2022 EIR assumed that historic buildings (Category A resources) would not be redeveloped for housing. (2022 EIR, App. C, pp. 10, 17). The 2022 EIR stated, "The department's housing growth projection factored in the locations of known historic districts in San Francisco and assumed that future development would primarily occur outside those districts." (2022 EIR p. 4.2-82). The HE EIR conceded that its "analysis cannot anticipate the exact manner in which future construction may be designed or whether such projects will propose altering or demolishing historic resources." (2022 EIR p. 4.2-85.) The 2022 EIR stated:

> The representative pattern of growth depicted in the department's projection of future housing units under the Housing Element 2022 Update takes into account

> the presence of individual built-environment historic resources and historic districts identified as of 2021 (including resources designated or found eligible for listing in local, state, and federal historic resource registers). Specifically, the projection assumes future housing construction would be less likely to occur on parcels that currently contain Category A resources (i.e., properties that are already known to qualify as historic resources)... This assumption reflects that Category A resource status would act as a development constraint for future housing development construction. Additionally, the planning department did not increase height limits in historic districts identified in [the Planning Code]. (2022 EIR, App. C, pp. 10, 17.)

However, the Rezone now identifies numerous historic resources for upzoning for residential development, contrary to the analysis in the 2022 EIR.

The 2022 EIR concluded that any impacts to historic resources would be significant even after mitigation. By increasing impacts to historic resource, the 2025 Rezone will have "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," and a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).) The 2022 EIR concluded that even with the implementation of mitigation, impacts to "project-level and cumulative: built-environment historic resources" would be significant and unmitigated. (2022 EIR p. S-4.) "Because demolition of built-environment historic resources or alteration in an adverse manner could still occur, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation." (2022 EIR, p. 4.2-100.)

In *Communities for a Better Environ. v. Calif. Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98 at 122-125 (*CBE v. CRA*), the court held that when a "first tier" EIR admits a significant, unavoidable environmental impact, a lead agency must prepare second tier EIRs for later projects to ensure that those unmitigated impacts are "mitigated or avoided." (Id.) The court reasoned that the unmitigated impacts were not "adequately addressed" in the first tier EIR since they were not "mitigated or avoided." (Id.) Thus, significant effects disclosed in first tier EIRs will trigger second tier EIRs unless such effects have been "adequately addressed," in a way that ensures the effects will be "mitigated or avoided." (Id.) Such a second tier EIR is required even if the impact still cannot be fully mitigated and a statement of overriding considerations will be required. The court explained, "The requirement of a statement of overriding considerations is central to CEQA's role as a public accountability statute; it requires public officials, in approving environmentally detrimental projects, to justify their decisions based on counterbalancing social, economic or other benefits, and to point to substantial evidence in support." (Id. at 124-125.) Since the 2022 EIR determined that impacts to historic resources would be significant and unmitigated, supplemental CEQA review is required for the 2025 Rezone, which increases impacts to historic resources.

The Rezone allows high-rise development in the Northeast Sector of the City, including in the historic district of North Beach. These areas were not included for development in the 2022 Housing Element, and the impacts of this development on historic resources was not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. By moving over 5000 units of new housing to this area, the Rezone exacerbates the impact on historic resources. Since this

is “one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR,” (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)(A)), a supplemental EIR is required to analyze and mitigate this impact. Since this impact is beyond the scope of the 2022 EIR, it is subject to the fair argument standard.

The Housing Element EIR Addendum fails to analyze impacts of additional height and density increases, as well as changes in zoning use districts, on designated historic resources or historic districts or areas with known concentrations of “A” rated historic resources, but not yet designated as historic districts. Bridget Maley’s letter includes a listing of historic resources adversely affected by the Rezone. Impacts to these historic resources were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR and must be analyzed in a Supplemental EIR. That list included herein by reference. It includes, but is not limited to:

- Fully documented North Beach National Register Historic District submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office and awaiting hearing by the State Historical Resource Commission was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR .The Rezone could have significant impacts to this identified historic district, including heights rezoned from 40 feet to 50 feet in block Block 0076.
- Designated Northeast Waterfront Article 10 Historic District.
- Eligible Washington Square Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Eligible Upper Grant Avenue Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR .
- Designated Otis Elevator Company National Register No. 99001265 (1 Beach Street; Parcel 0018/001).
- Designated Grabhorn Press Building National Register No. 97000349 (1335 Sutter Street; Parcel 0690/012A).
- Designated Thomas Payne House National Register No. 80000847 (1409 Sutter Street; Parcel 0689/025). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet.
- Designated Washington Square Article 10 Landmark No. 226 ( 1651 Stockton Street and Filbert Street; 0102/022001) . The parcels on the northern edge of Washington Square are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR . This could result in significant impacts to this park.
- Temple Sherith Israel National Register #10000114 (2266 California St., Parcel 0637/011).

- Designated Cable Car National Register Historic District No. 66000233. The Cable Car lines located within areas being upzoned and/or density decontrolled by the Upzone Plan could be significantly impacted.
- Designated Grace Cathedral Article 10 Landmark No. 170 (1100 California Street; Parcel 0246/001). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Old Flood Mansion, Pacific Union Club, both Article 10 Landmark No. 64 and National Register No. 66000230 (1000 California Street; Parcel 0245/001).
- Historic Category "A" rated buildings across the city would be impacted by the Rezone as it affords no protection for these previously identified but not designated historic resources. The City of San Francisco Planning Department has previously required full Historic Resource Evaluations for projects involving Category "A" rated buildings. This policy change was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Casebolt House Article 10 Landmark No 51 (2727 Pierce Street, Parcel 0560/005). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Spreckels Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 197 (2080 Washington Street, Parcel 0601/005. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Haas-Lilienthal House Article 10 Landmark No. 69 and National Register No 730000438 (2007 Franklin St. 0600/002). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Sacred Heart Parish Complex Article 10 Landmark No.316 and National Register 10000112 (660 Oak Street, Parcel 0828/012; 735 Fell Street, Parcel 0828/022A; 554 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/22; and 546-548 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/21). The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Many other historic buildings listed in letter of Bridget Maley.

## B. HEIGHT AND RELATED IMPACTS.

The Rezone will allow construction of buildings up to 350-feet taller than analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR analyzed building height ranging from 55 feet to 300 feet high. (Addendum 11). The Rezone allows building heights up to 500 feet high, and up to 650 feet high in two areas. (Addendum 11). These taller buildings are beyond the scope of the 2022 EIR, triggering the fair argument standard of review, as in the *Save Our Access* cases, discussed above. As the court of appeal held in *Save Our Access II*, supplemental CEQA review is required to analyze all of the impacts stemming from the greater building heights allowed by the Rezone.

**1. Biological Impacts.**

The Addendum admits that taller buildings may have biological impacts by obstructing flight paths of birds and impacting movement of special status species. (Addendum 48-49). The 2022 EIR found biological impacts to be less than significant. Since the Rezone will have significant biological impacts, the project will have "one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)(A),) and a supplemental EIR is required.

The 2022 EIR did not analyze biological impacts since it found the impact to be less than significant. (2022 EIR, p. 4.1-1.) Since the EIR found biological impacts to be less than significant, it imposed no mitigation measures. (2022 EIR, p. 4.1-149.) Since biological impacts were not examined as significant effects in the 2022 EIR, CEQA review is now mandated because the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration. (CEQA Guildelines 15163(a)(3)(A)).

Expert wildlife biologist Dr. Smallwood, Ph.D., concludes that the 2025 Rezone will have significant biological impacts not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. (Exhibit C). Dr. Smallwood concludes that by adding 4,000 additional residential units, changing the spatial distribution of the buildings, and increasing building heights, that the Rezone will have greater impacts on birds than the 2022 Plan. In particular, he concludes that the Rezone will have greater impacts on bird-window collisions, and that these impacts will not be adequately mitigated by the City's bird-safe window requirements. (Smallwood at 2-3). Dr. Smallwood states, "the additional 4,000 residential units could result in very large numbers of collision fatalities despite implementation of the City's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings." (Id. at 3).

Dr. Smallwood notes that San Francisco includes areas in the Pacific Flyway and areas that are rich in biological diversity. He states, "San Francisco is situated within the Pacific Flyway, which is one of the most intensely used bird migration pathways in the world." (Id. at 13). He states that "there are 147 special-status species of wildlife documented near enough to the project site to warrant a closer look at their occurrence likelihoods for the purpose of predicting potential project impacts." (Id.at 3). Dr. Smallwood concludes that the 2025 Rezone will result in 7,095 additional bird fatalities each year compared to the 2022 Plan, to a 95% confidence level. (Id. at 12). Dr. Smallwood concludes:

> Nearly all predicted deaths would be of birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and under the California Migratory Bird Protection Act, thus causing significant impacts. Given the predicted level of bird-window collision mortality, it is my opinion that the proposed project would result in potentially significant adverse biological impacts, including the unmitigated take of aerial habitats of birds, bats and other volant wildlife. Not only would the project take habitat of rare and sensitive species of birds, but it would transform the building's airspace into a lethal collision trap to birds. (Id. at 13).

Dr. Smallwood concludes that CEQA review is required to analyze patterns of bird movement through the City and to propose feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid impacts. (Id. at 17).

**2. Wind.**

The 2022 EIR concluded that the Housing Element would have significant and unmitigated wind impacts. (Addendum 99). The 2022 EIR did not analyze the impacts of the taller buildings allowed in the 2025 Rezone. The 2022 EIR assumed that projects would "stay within existing height limits." (2022 EIR, App. C, p. 17, 3.)

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will have significant unmitigated wind impacts. (Addendum 108). It concluded that buildings over 85-feet tall would have significant wind impacts. (Addendum 104). The Rezone will add taller buildings over 85-feet to more areas of the City, resulting in much greater wind impacts. Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)(B)), a supplemental EIR is required.

The Rezone allows buildings of up to 650-feet tall in certain areas. It allows increased heights along Market Street between Castro and Van Ness. Up to 160 feet. (Addendum 100). The Rezone allows 85-feet heights along Geary, and up to 300 feet at Geary and Masonic. (Addendum 101). The height difference between the rezoned blocks and the surrounding blocks with low heights would result in wind speeds that would likely exceed the hazard criteria. (Addendum 102).

The 2022 EIR stated, "Wind impacts are generally caused by large building masses that are substantially taller than their surroundings." (2022 EIR, p. 4.7-2.) The 2022 EIR states, "All projects greater than 85 feet In height would require a screening-level assessment conducted by a qualified wind expert in consultation with the department to determine their potential to result in a new wind hazard exceedance or aggravate an existing pedestrian-level wind hazard exceedance defined as the one-hour wind hazard criterion with a 26 mph equivalent wind speed." (2022 EIR, p. 4.7-11.) Since the Rezone will allow much taller buildings, well over 85-feet tall and up to 650-feet tall, it will have significant wind impacts under the standards set forth in the 2022 EIR, and an SEIR is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts.

The Rezone includes a change to the City's wind ordinance that requires CEQA review for buildings over 85 feet. The Rezone proposes to change the hazard criterion such that proposed development must not create any net new exceedance of 26 MPH wind speed for nine hours or more in a year, rather than one hour. (Addendum 104). In other words, after the Rezone, a building may cause hazardous wind conditions for a full workday, which is not currently allowed. The Rezone also eliminates an existing code requirement for "landscaping and/or wind baffling measure shall be installed on the windward side .. of the areas of concern.:" (Addendum 109).

By allowing vastly greater building heights, and eliminating previously existing mitigation standards and mitigation measures, the Rezone will have much greater wind

impacts that were never analyzed in the 2022 EIR. A supplemental EIR is required to analyze these wind impacts because "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(B)), and "Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative." (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(D)).

**3. Shadow.**

The vastly taller buildings allowed by the Rezone will have significant shadow impacts exceeding the City's CEQA significance thresholds. The 2022 Housing Element had significant unmitigated shadow impacts on Duboce Park, Larsen Playgrond, and Laurel Hill Playground.(Addendum 110-111). The Rezone creates new significant unmitigated shadow impacts on public parks including but not limited to, Noe Valley Town Square and Helen Wills Park, (Addendum 111, 113, 119) and on other parks and open spaces in areas added by the Rezone to the Northeast District including Washington Square, Joe DiMaggio Playground, and Levi Plazza Park. A supplemental EIR is required to analyze these impacts because "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(B))

We submit herewith the analysis of shadow expert Adam Noble of the consulting firm FastCast. (Exhibit D). Mr. Noble concludes that the Rezone will result in net new shadow impacts on Joe DiMaggio Playground not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This is a zero-tolerance park, not allowed to have any additional shadow under CEQA and Measure M (Planning Code Section 295). Mr. Noble's analysis shows that on certain periods of the year and times of day, the Rezone will more than double the amount of shadow on Joe DiMaggio Park.

The City contends that a project that adds new shadow to sidewalks or a publicly accessible open space (whether subject to Section 295 or not) does not necessarily result in a significant impact under CEQA. The shadow impact analysis described in the city's Initial Study CEQA Checklist examines whether a project would "***create new shadow that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces***".

Under planning code section 295 and the joint Planning Commission/Recreation and Park Commission criterion, the impact of any amount of shadow cast by a project on public parks, open spaces, or recreational facilities under the jurisdiction of SFRPD would be considered "significant" if it would affect a facility with an established quantitative limit.

Joe DiMaggio Playground has an established quantitative limit of zero, and as detailed below, the proposed rezoning would have a net increase in shadow cast on the playground, and would therefore, result in a significant impact.

In assessing impacts per the City's CEQA significance criterion, the environmental review requires evaluation of quantitative and qualitative factors but requires ***use and enjoyment of the park or public space to be substantially and adversely affected for the impact to be "significant."*** Therefore, the City contends that in certain situations, new shadow effects on an open space might not be a significant environmental impact under CEQA but could be found to be significant under planning code section 295. (Housing Element EIR p 4.8-17)[4]

Because Joe DiMaggio playground is heavily used throughout all periods of the day throughout the year by residents from the neighborhood and nearby neighborhoods, as well as schools for P.E. classes, the additional shadow would adversely and substantially impact the use and enjoyment of the park.

As detailed in Mr. Noble's analysis, this would be particularly true for fall periods when shadow impacts would be the most significant and lower temperatures create a greater need for sunlight to be able to enjoy the park.

**C. DISPLACEMENT.**

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will result in displacement of low-income residents, small businesses, and legacy businesses. (Addendum 37-38). The Addendum states, "new market-rate housing development may contribute to indirect displacement of lower-income communities in San Francisco." (Addendum 37). It continues, "there could be a connection between market rate housing development and displacement." (Addendum 38). By allowing more market rate housing in the Rezone than in the 2022

---

[4] Commenter disputes the City's shadow impacts methodology because it conflicts with well-established court of appeal precedent. Where a local or regional policy of general applicability, such as an ordinance, is adopted in order to avoid or mitigate environmental effects, a conflict with that policy in itself indicates a potentially significant impact on the environment. (*Pocket Protectors v. Sacramento* (2005) 124 Cal.App.4th 903.) Indeed, any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable plans must be discussed in an EIR. (14 CCR § 15125(d); *City of Long Beach v. Los Angeles Unif. School Dist.* (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 889, 918*; Friends of the Eel River v. Sonoma County Water* Agency (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859, 874 (EIR inadequate when Lead Agency failed to identify relationship of project to relevant local plans).) A Project's inconsistencies with local plans and policies constitute significant impacts under CEQA. (*Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 783-4; *Georgetown Preservation Society v. County of El Dorado* (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 358.) Since the Rezone Project has significant impacts under Prop M (Section 295), it also has significant impacts under CEQA. However, because the Rezone Project has significant shadow impacts even under the City's improperly narrow interpretation of the law, the issue is moot.

Housing Element, this displacement impact will be exacerbated. According to an economic analysis prepared by the San Francisco Office of the Controller, as a result of Rezone 500 to 1,000 additional units would be demolished over 20 years. Many of these units will be rent-controlled (pre-1979) units since these properties will have the lowest land value. This is very different than the 2022 Housing Element, which avoided Priority Equity Geographies (PEGs), where lower income residents live. By contrast, the Rezone includes large PEG areas, where displacement is inevitable.

While the Supervisors are considering measures to provide some protection for rent-controlled properties with 3 or more units, this does nothing to protect the thousands of duplex rent-controlled properties found throughout the Richmond and Sunset Districts and elsewhere in the City. Ms. Holley calculates that the Rezone will affect 3,838 2-unit rent-controlled parcels with 7,676 rent-controlled units. Holley states (Exhibit A):

> under the rezoning, there are a significant number of two-unit rent-controlled buildings on parcels with an existing height limit of 40 feet that would be rezoned to allow heights of 50', 65' and 85', and would no longer require setbacks, creating greater incentives and likelihood that they would be redeveloped under the proposed rezoning.

Also, the Rezone allows increased development in North Beach and the Western Addition (Addendum 19), which include high levels of rent-controlled units and Priority Equity Geographies, which were excluded from development in the 2022 Housing Element. San Francisco Planning Code states that "The Priority Equity Geographies SUD is comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations" and that the 2022 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan ((2022 Housing Element) identifies them as "areas…where zoning changes must be tailored to serve the specific needs of the communities that live there; and where programs that stabilize communities and meet community needs need to be prioritized."

The Rezone shifts 5,100 units of housing to the Northeast District, (Addendum 19) which is home to the highest percentage of rent-controlled units in the City. The Rezone adds 939 parcels in PEG areas, with 2,321 units, including 70 two-unit rent-controlled buildings with 140 units.

Urban Planner Deborah Holley states, "The inclusion of parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR."

Allowing this development and displacement in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD is flatly inconsistent with the 2022 EIR and the 2022 Plan since the stated purpose of the 2022 Plan was to focus development on "well-resourced areas" and away from Priority Equity Geographies. The 2025 Rezone does the exact opposite of the stated goal of the 2022 Plan, which is an obvious inconsistency requiring supplemental CEQA review.

Ms. Holley also points out that the Rezone for the first time adds Laguna Honda Hospital. Redevelopment of this parcel would result in massive displacement. Ms. Holley

states, "The 62-acre Laguna Honda hospital and rehabilitation center located 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard was added to the rezoning plan, and if redeveloped would result in significant displacement impacts for the long-term nursing home residents. Laguna Honda has 769 beds and offers short-term rehab and long-term nursing care…The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' which covers the majority of the 62 acres under existing height limits, to 85' for the entire site, and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing."

Displacement is an environmental issue under CEQA. (*Save Berkeley Neighborhoods v. Regents* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th 226, 233 (displacement of tenants is a CEQA impact)). CEQA requires the lead agency to determine whether the "environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly," (PRC § 21083(b)(3), (d)). CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XII provides that a project will have significant impacts where it will:

- Induce substantial population growth or concentration of population in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new housing or businesses), or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. See CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XII.

The Addendum suggests vague mitigation measures such as "advancing equitable housing access, promoting racial and social equity, and eliminating displacement with strategies such as tenant protections, preservation of affordability, production of affordable housing, and advancing equitable access to housing resources and affordable units." However, these are vague and unenforceable measures. The Addendum fails to propose any binding and enforceable mitigation measures, such as requiring the mandatory construction of affordable housing, requiring payment for the construction of affordable housing, or requiring public lands to be used for 100% affordable housing. In fact, the city is reversing or weakening all of these requirements. The 2025 Rezone requires absolutely no affordable housing.

A public agency may not rely on mitigation measures of uncertain efficacy or feasibility. (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 727.) "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors. (14 CCR § 15364.) Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements or other legally binding instruments. (14 CCR § 15126.4(a)(2).) In fact, proposals to provide benefits to legacy businesses, may not be legally allowable, let alone, legally enforceable. (*City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson* (1980) 27 Cal.3d 123, 134.)

The Rezone is reminiscent of the City's "urban renewal" of the Western Addition in the 1960s and 1970s, which wiped out what was at that time one of the most ethnically diverse communities in the United States and displaced much of the City's African-American community. Like the current "Family Zoning Plan," the urban renewal of the Western Addition was justified by the alleged need for more affordable housing. However, to make way for the new housing, the City destroyed a thriving African-American, Latino and Asian-American community, which never fully recovered, and the new housing was occupied largely by wealthier, white residents. The main difference is that the 2025 Family Zoning Plan is now targeting the City's Chinese Community, in the Richmond and Sunset Districts, which will undoubtedly face widescale displacement under the Rezone. This form of "White Urbanism" is now well-documented. (See, e.g,, Goetz, Whiteness and Urban Planning, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol 86 (2020).)

The Federal Reserve Bank has concluded that supply-side constraints such as zoning and environmental regulation have absolutely no impact on housing costs. The single most significant factors driving high housing costs are extreme wealth disparities, and remote work. (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, J. Mondragon, Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities (2025), https://www.frbsf.org/research-and-insights/publications/working-papers/2025/03/supply-constraints-do-not-explain-house-price-and-quantity-growth-across-u-s-cities/); Federal Reserve Bank, J. Mondragon, Housing Demand and Remote Work (2025), https://www.nber.org/papers/w30041). Building more luxury housing does not decrease housing costs and in fact often leads to gentrification of previously affordable neighborhoods. Trickle-down economics did not work in the Reagan Administration and it will not work now.

Since the Rezone will displace both existing housing and people, it will have a significant impact that must be analyzed in a supplemental EIR. The SEIR must consider mitigation measures and feasible alternatives to reduce this impact.

## D. AIR QUALITY AND CANCER RISK.

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will create significant air quality impacts, including additional cancer risk from fine particulate matter, known as PM-2.5. (Addendum 95). The Housing Element EIR admitted significant unmitigated PM-2.5 cancer risk (Addendum 90), but the Rezone will have even greater air quality and cancer risks since it allows more development and taller buildings, and will result in more vehicle miles traveled (VMT). (Addendum 90, 92-93).

The 2022 EIR concluded that buildings under 240-feet and 495 units would have less than significant construction air quality impacts. (Addendum 89). Taller buildings have significant PM-2.5 and nitrogen oxide impacts. (Addendum 94). But allowing taller and larger buildings, the Rezone will create more significant construction air quality impacts, including emissions of cancer-cause PM-2.5. The Rezone will have significant unmitigated cancer risk from PM-2.5 and the Rezone will change the distribution of those risks compared to the Housing Element. (Addendum 95).

The 2022 EIR concluded that even with the implementation of mitigation, air quality impacts would be significant and unmitigated. (2022 EIR, p. S-4, 4.6-56, 4,6-70.) By adding another 4,000 housing units, the 2025 Rezone will have "Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR." (CEQA Guidelines §15164(a)(3)(B).)

Attached hereto are the comments of Dr. Paul Rosenfeld and Matthew Hagemann, P.G., C. Hg., of the environmental consulting firm Soil, Water, Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE). (Exhibit E). SWAPE notes that the Addendum erroneously states, "The proposed rezoning program and subsequent development is expected to result in the same significant criteria air pollutant impacts from construction but not substantially more severe impacts than those disclosed in the EIR" (Addendum 93). However, SWAPE points out that by adding 4,000 additional residential units, the Rezone vastly exceeds air quality significance threshold set by the Bay Area Air District ("BAAD").

The Bay Area Air District has published screening thresholds to determine whether proposed projects will have significant impacts to air quality. (https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-4-screening_final-pdf.pdf?rev=ac551d35a52d479dad475e7d4c57afa6&sc_lang=en) Under the official BAAQMD thresholds, construction of 416 apartments is expected to have significant air quality impacts from the construction phase, and 638 apartments are expected to have significant operational air quality impacts. The addition of 4,000 residential units will vastly exceed these significance thresholds, and will therefore have a significant impacts on air quality that must be analyzed under CEQA. (SWAPE at 4).

SWAPE calculates that the additional 4,000 units of housing will create emissions of Reactive Organic Gases (ROGs) of 148 pounds per day (ppd) for the construction phase (far above the CEQA significance threshold of 54 ppd) and 145 ppd of operation ROG emissions (far above the CEQA significance threshold of 54 ppd). (SWAPE at 5). SWAPE concludes, "This finding indicates a potentially significant air quality impact that the Addendum did not identify or address. In our opinion, a subsequent EIR should be conducted to provide a more substantial calculation of the Project's emissions and a more detailed evaluation of the Project's potential air quality impacts." (SWAPE at 5).

When a project exceeds an Air District CEQA significance threshold, as here, this alone establishes substantial evidence that the project will have a significant adverse environmental impact. Indeed, in many instances, such air quality thresholds are the only criteria reviewed and treated as dispositive in evaluating the significance of a project's air quality impacts. (See, e.g. *Schenck v. County of Sonoma* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 949, 960 [County applies Air District's "published CEQA quantitative criteria" and "threshold level of cumulative significance"]; see also *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 110-11 ["A 'threshold of significance' for a given environmental effect is simply that level at which the lead agency finds the effects of the project to be significant"].) The California Supreme Court has shown the importance an air district significance threshold has in providing substantial

evidence of a significant adverse impact. (*Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist*. (2010) 48 Cal.4th 310, 327 [estimated emissions in excess of air district's significance thresholds "constitute substantial evidence supporting a fair argument for a significant adverse impact"].)

Also, in 2025 city released a new APEZ (air pollutant exposure zone) map showing areas with high cancer risk. The Rezone allows development in some of these newly identified areas. This is a significant new information and a changed circumstance that was not known at the time of the 2022 EIR. (Addendum 95). The new APEZ areas include Sunset Blvd, and Lake Merced. These areas will receive significant development under the Rezone. This impact must be analyzed. (Addendum 96). The Addendum admits that the cancer risks created by the Rezone in the new APEZ areas are significant and unmitigated. (Addendum 97). The Northeast District is within the APEZ area. By moving over 5000 units of new housing to this area, the Rezone exacerbates cancer risks from airborne pollutants.

A supplemental EIR is required because "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR." (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(B).) Also, the new APEZ map constitutes, "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete." (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3).)

SWAPE states,

> The Addendum proposes development in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, which have areas within the City's air pollutant exposure zones ("APEZ"). The Addendum states that "the proposed rezoning program may result in a small proportion of additional rezoned parcels being in the APEZ, which could increase the number of people exposed to the generally high pollutant concentrations in the APEZ" (p. 97).
>
> In 2025, the City identified new APEZ areas, defined as locations "where particulate matter (PM2.5) is greater than or equal to 9 µg/m3 or where the risk of cancer from air pollutants is greater than or equal to 100 in a million." (SWAPE at 5).

The Addendum concludes that this impact is "significant and unavoidable." (Addendum 97). SWAPE disagrees with this conclusion and proposes numerous feasible mitigation measures to reduce air pollution impacts that should be analyzed in a supplemental EIR. (SWAPE at 7-9). Among the mitigation measures suggested by SWAPE are requiring the use of ultra-low VOC paints, advanced air filtration units, emissions controls on backup generators, and many other measures. These mitigation measures should all be analyzed and imposed through a supplemental EIR process.

**E. TRANSIT DELAY.**

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will create significant impacts related to public transit delay, particularly along the busy 19th Avenue corridor, and on the 38-Geary and 19-Polk lines. (Addendum 71, 78, 84). The Addendum concludes that Rezone would contribute considerably to significant and unavoidable bus loading impacts. (Addendum 84). These impacts, particularly along the 19th Avenue corridor, will be exacerbated by the recent closure of the Great Highway, which has caused congestion on 19th Avenue by closing a major thoroughfare in the Western side of the City. The closure of the Great Highway is a changed circumstance that was unknown at the time of the 2022 EIR.

A supplemental EIR is required because "substantial changes [have] occur[ed] with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects." (CEQA Guidelines §15162(a)(2).) The closure of the Great Highway is clearly a significant changed circumstance that was not analyzed in the 2022 EIR and that will impact the Transportation analysis for the Rezone.

**F. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

The Rezone will allow residential development on the site of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility. This site was not slated for development in the 2022 Plan. This amendment will require either a replacement facility or vast amounts of infrastructure to transport sewage to other plants. The sewage currently treated by the North Point Plant must go somewhere. Urban Planner Deborah Holley states, "This City-owned and -operated sewage treatment plant is one of three facilities in San Francisco that treats wastewater. It is only active during wet weather and treats up to 150 million gallons a day (MGD) during rainstorms, or 26 percent of the wastewater treated on a rainy day." She continues, "The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of this treatment plant with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' to 85' and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional. There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development at this location. Since it is inconceivable that a developer would build housing on top of a sewage treatment plant, the City needs to analyze the impacts associated with elimination of the sewage treatment plant." Ms. Holley states:

> Elimination of the sewage treatment plant would result in reduced sewage treatment capacity during wet weather. This would require (a) the construction of a new sewage treatment facility in this area of the city, or (b) the construction of new infrastructure to convey wastewater from the northeast quadrant of the city to the Oceanside Treatment Plant or the Southeast Treatment Plant in Bayview/Hunters

Point and expansion of one of these facilities to expand the treatment capacity by 150 MGD to compensate for the loss of the North Point facility.

The potential public health and hazardous materials impacts of redeveloping the site with housing must be identified and analyzed and mitigation measures must be identified in a supplemental EIR. This includes but would not be limited to testing and classification of contaminants, calculations of health risk, specific remediation measures, associated secondary impacts due to the excavation of contaminated soil, transportation and disposal of infrastructure, and treatment and disposal of contaminated water and soil.

CEQA does not allow the City to defer analysis of obvious sewage treatment needs. When a project will require construction of additional sewage treatment infrastructure, the CEQA document must analyze and mitigate the impacts of that necessary new construction. (*Sundstrom v. Cnty. of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 296; *San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Ctr. v. Cnty. of Stanislaus* (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 713 (EIR was also inadequate with respect to project description by its lack of reference to wastewater treatment plant which was necessary element of project).)

## V. GENERAL PLAN ANALYSIS.

The Rezone is legally prohibited because it is inconsistent with the General Plan. "The Legislature has mandated that every county and city must adopt a 'comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city, and of any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency's judgment bears relation to its planning.'" (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Sups*. (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 570 (quoting Gov. Code §65300).) The Supreme Court has described the general plan as "the constitution for all future developments within the city or county." *Id*. (internal quotation marks omitted). The "propriety of virtually any local decision affecting land use and development depends upon consistency with the applicable general plan and its elements." (*Id. DeVita v. Cty. of Napa*, 9 Cal. 4th 763, 803 (1995).) The "propriety of virtually any local decision affecting land use and development depends upon consistency with the applicable general plan and its elements." (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Sups.* (1990) 52 C.3d 553, 570.)

The Rezone is flatly inconsistent with the adopted General Plan, and its adopted Housing Element. The Rezone allows development in historic districts, such as North Beach and Telegraph Hill, which were protected from development in the General Plan. The Rezone allows development in Priority Equity Geographies that were protected from development in the General Plan. The Rezone allows building heights and density throughout the City that vastly exceed limits set forth in the General Plan. As such, the Rezone is legally prohibited unless and until the City amends its General Plan.

In addition, each of these General Plan inconsistencies is a significant impact that must be analyzed in an EIR. Any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable plans must be discussed in an EIR. (14 CCR § 15125(d); *City of Long Beach v. Los Angeles Unif. School Dist*. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 889, 918; *Friends of the Eel*

*River v. Sonoma County Water Agency* (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859, 874 (EIR inadequate when Lead Agency failed to identify relationship of project to relevant local plans).) A Project's inconsistencies with local plans and policies constitute significant impacts under CEQA. (*Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 783-4.)

## VI. CONCLUSION.

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission direct the Planning Staff to prepare a Supplement EIR to analyze the Rezone and to consider feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce its significant environmental impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR for the Housing Element. We further request that the Planning Commission conclude that the Rezone is prohibited since it is inconsistent with the City's General Plan.

Sincerely,



Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

# EXHIBIT A

December 1, 2025

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA  94612

**RE: Adequacy of the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR Addendum**

Dear Mr. Drury,

The San Francisco Planning Department published an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2022 Housing Element ("Housing Element FEIR") on September 3, 2025, stating that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review was required for the Family Housing Rezoning Program ("proposed rezoning program, Family Zoning Plan, FZP, rezoning plan").

Because there are potential new or more severe environmental impacts that would result from the proposed rezoning program that were not identified and analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, a supplemental EIR should have been prepared instead of an Addendum.

Such impacts include, but are not limited to the following:

A. The rezoning plan would result in new impacts associated with the potential redevelopment of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility which was not included and therefore not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR but which, as a result of the rezoning plan, is now designated as a site for the development of housing.

B. The rezoning plan would result in more severe displacement impacts, particularly those associated with the addition of numerous parcels within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD that were added to the rezoning plan but not included, and therefore not analyzed, in the Housing Element FEIR.

My qualifications for preparing this analysis include over 25 years of professional experience in land use and environmental planning, including the management and preparation of CEQA documents, and a Master of Science degree in Urban Planning

from Columbia University. My resume can be accessed via this link: https://www.holleyconsulting.com/resume/.

The Addendum to the Housing Element FEIR maintains that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required for the proposed rezoning program because the environmental impacts were adequately identified and analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, and the rezoning program "…would not result in any new or more severe environmental impacts than were identified previously."

Specifically, the Addendum states that "…no additional environmental review is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guideline Sections 15162-15164 for the following reasons:

(1) the Family Housing Rezoning Program would not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Housing Element EIR;
(2) no substantial changes have occurred that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Housing Element EIR; and
(3) no new information of substantial importance has become available which would indicate that (i) the Family Housing Rezoning Program will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR; (ii) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible, or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Housing Element EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment."

**2022 FEIR compared to Proposed Rezoning**

***Baseline Map***. In order to understand what was analyzed in the 2022 FEIR, and what was added in subsequent policy changes, I reconstructed "Figure 2-7 Projected Heights and Density Controls Under the Proposed Action" from page 2-25 of Vol. 1 of the FEIR. ***Figure 1***, below, provides the most detailed description of the parcel-level impacts of the proposed rezoning for parcels analyzed in the 2022 Final EIR.




**Figure 1. Baseline Map: 2022 FER Map Compared to the September 2025 Map, plus removing 3-unit+ Rent-Controlled Buildings and Hotels**

The September 2025 map, based on the rezoning legislation introduced in board file 250700, was the most recent parcel-level map released by the Planning Department. The most significant amendments passed include exempting rent-controlled buildings of three units or larger from the local program, and exempting hotel parcels. *Planning recently released a November 17th map but it is not accurate as it does not yet exclude three-units+ rent controlled buildings.*

***Figure 2*** below shows that 6,938 new parcels were added in the proposed rezoning plan, 7,580 parcels have increased heights, and 16,135 parcels allow for greater densities. Associated unit counts were also estimated and are provided in the table following Figure 2.




**Figure 2. Parcels added and parcels with increased heights and densities under the rezoning**

1. **What was added to the Family Zoning Plan from the FEIR?**

| What was added | Added by FZP | Current Unit Count |
|---|---|---|
| New Parcels | 6,938 parcels | 12,150 units |
| Increased Height Parcels | 7,580 parcels | 10,009 units |
| Increased Density Parcels | 16,135 parcels | 16,135 units |
| **Total Unanalyzed Parcels** | **30,653 parcels** | **38,692 units impacted** |

**2) Scope of Family Zoning Plan vs. 2022 Final EIR**

| Total Count | Final EIR - 2022 | Family Zoning Plan - 2025 |
|---|---|---|
| Parcel Count | 82,834 | 79,932 |
| Current Units Count* | 150,031 | 94,281 |
| Area Added (sq ft) | 257,461,954 | 254,211,574 |

** Residential and non-residential "units" (commercial spaces) impacted*

3. **Existing Parcels with increased height limits**

**a.** **7,580 parcels** with increased height limits
**b.** **10,009 currently existing units** in parcels with increased height limits
**c.** **31,424,690 sq ft** of total lot area in parcels with increased height limits

| Height Limit Increase | Parcels | Current Unit Count |
|---|---|---|
| 100' + | 73 | 201 |
| 60' - 100' | 34 | 31 |
| 40' - 60' | 667 | 823 |
| 20' - 40' | 3,244 | 4,906 |
| < 20' | 3,562 | 4,048 |

The following discussion describes potential impacts that were not analyzed in the CEQA document for the rezoning project. The Addendum is inadequate under CEQA and a supplemental EIR must be prepared to identify and analyze the potentially new and more severe impacts described below.

**A. Rezoning of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility**

There are new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed rezoning plan that were not identified and assessed in the Housing Element EIR or Addendum including impacts associated with development of the North Point Wet Weather Facility located at Bay Street and the Embarcadero. This City-owned and -operated sewage treatment plant is one of three facilities in San Francisco that treats wastewater. It is only active during wet weather and treats up to 150 million gallons a day (MGD) during rainstorms, or 26 percent of the wastewater treated on a rainy day.

The 2022 FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of this treatment plant with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning at that time. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' to 85' and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional.

There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development at this location. Since it is inconceivable that a developer would build housing on top of a sewage treatment plant, the City needs to analyze the impacts associated with elimination of the sewage treatment plant.

Moreover, although the Addendum states that "It is likely that the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would experience reduced pollutant loads under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element because housing growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would be more evenly distributed in the western and northern parts of the city and along transit corridors, instead of heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts as assumed under the adopted housing element; thus pollutant load generation, would be more evenly distributed throughout the city rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city," there is no mention at all of the North Point treatment plant. (See pages 127-128 of the Addendum.)

Potentially significant impacts that should have been identified and analyzed in a supplemental EIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Elimination of the sewage treatment plant would result in reduced sewage treatment capacity during wet weather. This would require (a) the construction of a new sewage treatment facility in this area of the city, or (b) the construction of new infrastructure to convey wastewater from the northeast quadrant of the city to the Oceanside Treatment Plant or the Southeast Treatment Plant in Bayview/Hunters Point and expansion of one of these facilities to expand the treatment capacity by 150 MGD to compensate for the loss of the North Point facility.

2. The potential public health and hazardous materials impacts of redeveloping the site with housing must be identified and analyzed and mitigation measures must be identified in a supplemental EIR. This includes but would not be limited to

testing and classification of contaminants, calculations of health risk, specific remediation measures, associated secondary impacts due to the excavation of contaminated soil, transportation and disposal of infrastructure, and treatment and disposal of contaminated water and soil.

**B. More severe displacement Impacts would result from the proposed rezoning program than were assumed in the Housing Element FEIR**

Potentially significant displacement impacts that should have been identified and analyzed in a supplemental EIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. ***Rezoning and displacement of tenants in two-unit rent-controlled buildings***. As shown below, under the proposed rezoning, there are a significant number of two-unit rent-controlled buildings on parcels with an existing height limit of 40 feet that would be rezoned to allow heights of 50', 65' and 85', and would no longer require setbacks, creating greater incentives and likelihood that they would be redeveloped under the proposed rezoning. In other words, it is reasonably foreseeable that they would be redeveloped and therefore should have been considered in the CEQA review for the project.

**<u>Rent Controlled Parcels</u>**

| What was added | Parcels affected | Existing units affected |
|---|---|---|
| New Parcels | 1,237 parcels | 2,474 units |
| Increased Height Parcels | 1,818 parcels | 3,636 units |
| Increased Density Parcels | 783 parcels | 1,566 units |
| Total Rent Controlled Parcels | 3,838 parcels | 7,676 units |

It is widely accepted that tenants of two-unit rent-controlled buildings already have fewer protections than tenants who live in buildings with three or more units because a two-unit building can more easily be converted into condos. In two-unit buildings, all an owner needs to do is move in, and they can evict a tenant to do so.

The inclusion of parcels with two-unit rent controlled buildings in the rezoning plan and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR.

2. ***Rezoning and displacement in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District.*** Section 249.97 (b) of the San Francisco Planning Code states that "The Priority Equity Geographies SUD is comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations" and that the 2022 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan ((2022 Housing Element) identifies them as "***areas***…***where zoning changes must be tailored to serve the specific needs of the communities that live there; and where programs that stabilize communities and meet community needs need to be prioritized***."

   As shown in ***Figure 2*** above and quantified below, close to 1,000 parcels in the proposed rezoning program that were not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR are located within the PEG SUD. Displacement impacts for residents in these areas are more severe than for residents outside of the SUD.

   **New Priority Equity Geography Parcels**
   a. 939 parcels
   b. 2,321 current existing units (including RC and non-RC)
   c. 70 two-unit RC buildings, 140 units

   The inclusion of parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR.

3. ***Rezoning and displacement of Laguna Hospital and Rehabilitation Center occupants***. As shown in ***Figure, 2*** above, the 62-acre Laguna Honda hospital and rehabilitation center located 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard was added to the rezoning plan, and if redeveloped would result in significant displacement impacts for the long-term nursing home residents.

   Laguna Honda has 769 beds and offers short-term rehab and long-term nursing care. in the Forest Hill neighborhood of San Francisco.

   The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' which covers the majority of the 62 acres under existing height limits, to 85' for the entire site, and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional.

There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development there.

Because the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center was not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, a supplemental EIR is needed to determine the impacts and required mitigation measures.

# EXHIBIT B

November 30, 2025

Mr. Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

RE: Family Zoning Plan (Rezone) – Impacts on Historic Resources

Dear Mr. Drury,

This letter sets forth my professional opinion concerning the impacts on historic resources from the proposed San Francisco Rezoning Plan ("Rezone"), also known as the "Family Zoning Plan."

As a professional with 32 years of experience in historic preservation and with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), I meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History. I also have the following credentials: received a Master of Arts Degree in Architectural History from the University of Virginia's School of Architecture; previously served as president of the San Francisco Landmarks Advisory Board (appointed by Mayor Newsom); since 2012 have continuously been on the City of San Francisco Planning Department's approved consultant pool for historic resources consultants; and certified by the San Francsico Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) as a woman-owned Local Business Enterprise (LBE). I have written innumerable historic resource and historic district designation and evaluation reports throughout the course of my career.

While the City of San Francisco (City) prepared and certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for its 2022 Housing Element, the proposed Rezone is vastly different from the rezoning scenarios studied in the 2022 EIR. Nevertheless, the Planning Department proposes to rely on an Addendum (September 3, 2022) to the previously certified EIR. A rezoning of this magnitude requires thorough environmental review under CEQA so that the City's residents and decision-makers can be aware of its impacts, can consider all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, and can have a robust and open discussion prior to making irreversible changes to San Francisco's landscape for all time.

The Rezone would result in a myriad of significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR or included in the Housing Element, not the least of which are impacts to historic resources. The Rezone would result in significant impacts to historic resources that have not yet been analyzed. The 2022 EIR found significant and unmitigated impacts to historic resources, but the Rezone's impacts are far greater and substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR, with significant and unmitigated impacts. Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).)

a+h 1715 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone*: 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

As set forth in the Attachments to this letter, the Rezone would allow the demolition and redevelopment on, near, or within areas containing historic resources. Many known and designated, either locally under Article 10 of the Planning Code, or through state or federal historic designation programs, are within areas that were not included for rezoning in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, while others were included in the analysis, but have since been upzoned or changed to form based density or have significantly higher heights on or around them by the Upzone. None of the potentially significant impacts that could result from redevelopment of these historic resources were analyzed in the 2022 EIR. See the following attachments for further analysis: Attachment 1 - Historic Resource Impact Analysis of Rezone and Attachment 2 - North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District Parcel Analysis.

Since this new information provided in the Attachments constitute significant and substantially more severe effects not discussed in the 2022 EIR, a Supplemental EIR is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts. The newly identified impacts are beyond the scope of the 2022 EIR. The Addendum barely mentions additional historic resources impacts and fails to analyze impacts of the drastically additional height and density increases as they relate to known historic resources. Further, the Addendum fails to analyze changes in zoning use districts on designated historic resources or historic districts or areas with known concentrations of "A" rated historic resources, which are identified, but not yet designated resources.

Further, the Rezone now includes the following language related to Bonuses for "Historic Preservation." However, these bonuses, as shown below, encourage height increases, facadism, and other over-scaled additions that would result in diminished historic fabric and result in unintended impacts to historic resources. Additionally, this proposed legislation, added in the September 11, 2025 version of the legislation, has not been evaluated for its potentially significant impacts on historic resources.

The following language has been added to Section 206.10(e) of the Rezone legislation providing additional height and square footage bonuses for the "preservation" of Historic Building.

> *(e)* ***Additional Height, Square Footage, and Other Bonuses.*** *HC-SF Projects that contain certain uses, amenities, or other building features are eligible for additional bonuses and code modifications, as described below.*

*********

(6) ***Preservation of Historic Buildings.*** *In districts other than Residential districts, projects proposing an alteration to a Historic Building and/or constructing new buildings on sites that contain a Historic Building shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as provided below:*

*(A) up to 1.5 times the gross floor area foregone by retaining the Historic Building and complying with Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings, including through setting back building additions and/or new construction in relation to the Historic Building. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(56)(A), the foregone gross floor area shall be equal to the gross floor area within the volume that would otherwise be permitted under the Planning Code and all applicable Objective Standards, inclusive of modifications allowed pursuant to this Section 206.10, but is not being constructed in order to accommodate a reduced building mass above or around a Historic Building and that complies with or exceeds the setbacks or mass reductions required by the Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings. The Zoning Administrator may publish further guidance on the calculation of foregone gross floor area; and*

*(B)* for Historic Buildings with storefronts that contain character-defining features, an additional 0.25 square feet for every square foot of space in the storefront, provided that the project preserves the storefront in compliance with Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings; and

(C) *horizontal or vertical additions to accommodate this extra square footage, except that any such additions shall not:*

*(i) exceed 20 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit (Section 263.19); or*

*(ii) reduce the required rear yard above the ground floor to less than 15 feet where the site abuts the rear yard of adjacent parcels containing residential uses.*

(D*) The Historic Building* and/or historic storefront *shall be maintained in compliance with the Preservation Design Standards for the life of the project, and the requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.*

This late addition of the above language to the legislation has the great potential to cause impacts to historic resources, instead of preserving them, as it would allow large sections of historic buildings to be demolished and over scaled additions and height increases to be implemented as bonuses.

For the reasons listed above, and as set forth in the Attachments, it is my professional opinion that the Rezone, if approved, would have additional and substantially more severe impacts to historic resources than were analyzed in the certified EIR. These potentially significant environmental impacts must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") through a full recirculated Supplemental EIR.

Sincerely,

Bridget Maley
Principal

Attachment 1: Historic Resource Impact Analysis of Rezone
Attachment 2: North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District Parcel Analysis

a+h 1715 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone*: 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

**Attachment 1: Historic Resource Impact Analysis of Family Zoning Plan (Rezone)**
**November 30, 2025**
**Compiled by Bridget Maley, architecture + history, llc**

---

The Family Zoning Plan (Rezone) would result in significant new impacts on historic resources that were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in its associated Environmental Impact Report (2022 EIR). The area of the Rezone is significantly larger than the area included in the 2022 Housing Element and analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

It should be noted that all projects using the Rezone would be subject to form-based density (i.e. density decontrol) regardless of height limit or underlying zoning district. These height and density changes would encourage demolition of smaller-scale historic resources throughout the Rezone area.

In addition, for many parcels within the Rezone area, increases to the existing base height limits and/or changes from density limited to form based density (i.e. density decontrol) would be allowed for projects NOT using the Rezone, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses.

The Housing Element EIR Addendum No. 1 (September 3, 2025) fails to analyze impacts of additional height and density increases described above, as well as changes in zoning use districts, on designated historic resources and historic districts or on areas with known concentrations of “A” rated historic resources, but not yet designated as historic districts, including, but not limited to those resources listed below.

The list below includes landmarks and contributors to historic districts designated pursuant to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code that may be removed from the Upzone by a pending amendment to the Upzone legislation.

**Historic Resources Not Evaluated in 2022 Housing Element EIR**

The following districts and individual historic resources were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, but are now included in the Rezone as of November 2025.

- Fully documented North Beach National Register Historic District submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office and awaiting hearing by the State Historical Resource Commission was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone could have significant impacts to this identified historic district, including heights rezoned from 40 feet to 50 feet in block Block 0076. (See Attachment 2: List of Historic Resources in North Beach Historic District in Rezone.)

- Designated Northeast Waterfront Article 10 Historic District. Sansome Street Area Revision contained in “Appendix D: Memorandum Regarding Potential Zoning Map Changes in Supervisor District 3” disclosed the intent to include in the Rezone Plan areas within this Historic District centered along Sansome Street include the following seventeen parcels: Block 0085/Lots 005 and 048; Block 0106/Lots 001, 002, 003, 004, and 042; Block 0112/Lots 008 and 009; Block 0113/Lots 006, 041, 040, and 063; Block 0134/Lot 001; and Block 0135/Lots 007, 008, and 009. This area was not included in the

2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible Washington Square Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone now includes six parcels on Filbert Street between Powell Street and Stockton Street, including the Church of Saints Peter and Paul and the Priests' Residence, which could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible Upper Grant Avenue Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone now includes seven contributory buildings in this District along Filbert Street, Medau Place, and Grant Avenue (Blk 0088/Lots 5, 41-57, and 9), which could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Otis Elevator Company National Register No. 99001265 (1 Beach Street; Parcel 0018/001). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Grabhorn Press Building National Register No. 97000349 (1335 Sutter Street; Parcel 0690/012A). This parcel was rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses.This drastic upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Thomas Payne House National Register No. 80000847 (1409 Sutter Street; Parcel 0689/025). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses. This drastic upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Myrtle Street Flats Building, both National Register No. 76000520 and Article 10 Landmark No. 71 (234-248 Myrtle Street; Parcel 0714/020), sometimes referred to as part of the Goodman Building. This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 650 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 260 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses.This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Washington Square Article 10 Landmark No. 226 (1651 Stockton Street and Filbert Street; 0102/022001). The parcels on the northern edge of Washington Square are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this park.
- Designated Article 10 "Structure of Merit" The Cannery (600 Beach Street; Parcel 0010/001). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. As the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Building at 1840-1842 Eddy Street National Register No. 73000437 (1840-1842 Eddy Street, Parcel 1127/015). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 85 feet and changed to form-based density (density decontrol). This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Building at 45-57 Beideman Place National Register No. 73000436 (45-57 Beideman Place, Parcel 1100/118). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Building at 33-35 Beideman Place National Register No. 73000435 (33-35 Beideman Place, Parcel 1100/095). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated House at 1331-1335 Scott Street National Register No. 73000440 (1331-35 Scott Street, Parcel 1100/120). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated House at 1321 Scott Street National Register No. 7300439 (1321 Scott Street, Parcel 1100/049). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated House at 1249-1251 Scott Street National Register No. 73000442 (1249-51 Scott Street, Parcel 1127/035). This parcel now included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated House at 1239-1245 Scott Street National Register No. 7300441 (1239-45 Scott Street, Parcel 1127/043). This parcel now included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Temple Sherith Israel National Register #10000114 (2266 California St., Parcel 0637/011). Now included in the Rezone, this parcel is being upzoned from its existing 40 feet to 85 feet with a new base height of 50 feet. It is also changed to form based density and rezoned to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Dallam-Merritt House National Register #84001185 (2355 Washington Street, Parcel 0613/021). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Designated site of Third Baptist Church California Registered Historical Landmark No. 1010 (483 Greenwich Street, Parcel 0087047). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Designated Fillmore-Pine Building National Landmark No. 82002247 (1940-1946 Fillmore Street, Parcel 0660/023). Now in the Rezone, this parcel is being rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Park View Hotel National Register No. 83001235 (750 Stanyan Street, Parcel 1250/025). Now in the Rezone, this parcel is being rezoned from its existing height limit of 50 feet to 65 feet. This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Delane House National Register No. 82000984 (70 Buena Vista Terrace, Parcel 2608/013). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated House at 584 Page Street National Register No. 85002195 (584 Page Street, Parcel 0842/017). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Moss Beach House National Register No. 83001232 (1626 Great Highway, Parcel 1895/038). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Real Estate Associates (TREA) Houses National Register No. 85000705 (2503, 2524, 2530 and 2536 Clay Street (Parcel 0630/032, 0611/008, 0611/009 and 0611/010). Now in the Rezone, the house at 2503 Clay is upzoned from 40 feet to 65 feet. These 4 historic houses were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Wilford Houses National Register No.85001914 (2121 & 2127 Vallejo Street, Parcels 0565/021and 0565/022). Now in the Rezone, these parcels adjoin parcels upzoned to 65 feet. These 2 historic houses were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Sinton House National Register No. 11000944(1020 Francisco Street, Parcel 0476002C).Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Russian Hill Paris Block Architectural Historic District National Register of Historic Places Historic District No. 87002288. The Rezone includes four parcels in this District between Green Street and Macondray Lane (Block 0121/Lots 005, 006, 049, and 056), which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Russian Hill Macondray Lane National Register Historic District No. 87002286. The Rezone includes this entire Historic District, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this Historic District, especially corner parcels that could be up to 65 feet in height in this residential district.

- Designated Port of San Francisco Embarcadero National Register Historic District No. 06000372. The Rezone includes increased height and density along the Embarcadero, especially on Bay, North Point, Beach and Jefferson Streets, which could impact this Historic District. These heights, not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Golden Gate Park National Register Historic District No. 04001137. The Rezone includes height increases along Fulton Street and Lincoln Boulevard bordering the north and south sides of Golden Gate Park and Stanyon Street bordering the east side. The heights along Fulton Street are increased from 40 feet to 85 feet and along

Lincoln from 40 feet to 65 feet, both streets are changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned to RTO-C that allows commercial uses on the ground floors. Heights along a portion of Stanyan Street are rezoned from 50 feet to 65 feet. Heights are also increased in places along Fell and Oak Streets in the Panhandle of the Park. These proposed height, density, and use changes in the Rezone were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and would have significant impacts on this designated historic district.

- Designated Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark Historic District No. 66000232. Development proposed in the Rezone adjacent to the Presidio of San Francisco at 300 Lake Street; Parcel No. 1354/001, upzoned from 40 feet to 65 and from 65 feet to 85 feet. Also upzoned at the Lombard Gate from 40 feet to 65 feet. Additionally, development in the residential zoned areas of Presidio Terrace and Sea Cliff heights would be allowed to 65 feet on 8,000 square foot parcels. These Rezone heights were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel National Register Historic District No. 91000957. Height increases along the edges would impact this designated Historic District. The increased heights at Bush and Leavenworth Streets from the existing height limit of 65 feet to 120 feet and Polk Street between Geary and Sutter Streets from the existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet. These heights were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could impact this Historic District.

- Designated Veterans Affairs Medical Center National Register Historic District No. 05001112 (4150 Clement Street). Along the southern edge of this District the Rezone includes increases from the existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet on Clement Street. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could impact this Historic District.

- Designated Cable Car National Register Historic District No. 66000233. The Cable Car lines located within areas being upzoned and/or density decontrolled by the Upzone Plan could be significantly impacted. These include, without limitation, those lines along the following routes: Hyde between Beach and Washington, Washington between Hyde and Mason, Jackson between Leavenworth and Hyde, California between Van Ness and Mason, Mason between Green and Columbus, Columbus between Mason and Taylor, and Taylor between Chestnut and Francisco. Height increases adjacent to these streets could impact these linear transit historic resources, and construction activities resulting from development incentivized by the Upzone could cause extensive service interruptions. Impacts to the Cable Car National Register Historic District were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Geneva Office Building and Power House (S.F. & San Mateo Railroad Co.Office Building), both National Register No. 10000111 and Article 10 Landmark No. 180 (500 Geneva; Parcel 6972/036). The Rezone Plan upzones this publicly owned site from the existing height of 40 feet to 85 feet and includes it in the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Special Use District, which allows the site to be developed for mixed use residential development. The Rezone Plan also increases the base height limit from 40

feet to 50 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would allow development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses. New development on and adjacent to this historic site could result in significant impacts. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Eligible Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. The current Rezone includes a significant portion of the District. This area of Hayes Valley was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible Northpoint Sewage Treatment Plant Historic District, an eligible National Register and California Historic District. The District includes 101 North Point (Parcel 0033/005), 66 Bay Street (0034/002) and 160 Bay Street (0033/003). This entire site is increased from the existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. The Rezone of this eligible district was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this District.

- Designated Dietle Residence Article 10 Landmark No.48 (294 Page Street, Parcel 0839/017). Located within and adjacent to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District, the Rezone includes this parcel which is rezoned to RTO-1.This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Nightingale House Article 10 Landmark No. 47 (201 Buchanan Street, Parcel 0858/002). Located within and adjacent to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District, the Rezone includes this parcel which is rezoned to RTO-1.This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated McMorry-Lagan Building Article 10 Landmark No.164 (188-198 Haight Street, Parcels 0852/033 and 0852/034). Located within and adjacent to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District, the Rezone includes this parcel which is rezoned to RTO-1.This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Duboce Park Article 10 Historic District, specifically the contributory buildings located along Waller and Steiner Streets being rezoned RTO-1. Although certain parcels within the Duboce Park Historic District are proposed for removal from the Rezone by a pending amendment to the Upzone legislation (see list below), the contributory buildings located along Waller and Steiner Streets would remain in the Rezone. This Historic District was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

---

**Historic Resources Evaluated in 2022 Housing Element and 2022 EIR, But Now with Significant Height Increases**

- Designated St. Luke's Episcopal Church, National Register No. 100009644 (1755 Clay; Parcel 0622/013). Included in the 2022 EIR as being upzoned from its existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet, but height increased by the Rezone to 350 feet with a base height of 140 feet. These increased heights were not studied in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this historic site. Further, as the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed from the new base height.

- Designated Paige Motor Company National Register No. 83001234 (1699 Van Ness Parcel 0642/001). Included in the 2022 EIR as being upzoned from existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet, but height increased by the Rezone to 350 feet with a base height of 140 feet. These increased heights were not studied in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this historic site. Further, as the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed from the new base height.

- Eligible Ocean Avenue Commercial Historic District, a documented eligible California Register Historic District under review by the Planning Department. The EIR analyzed the height along Ocean Avenue at a height of 65 feet, which was increased by the Rezone to 85 feet. This increased height was not studied in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible fully documented Ingleside Terraces National Register Historic District submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office and awaiting hearing by the State Historical Resource Commission. The EIR analyzed the height along Ocean Avenue, Block 6915, with a height of 65 feet, which was increased by the Rezone to both 85 feet and 140 feet. These increased heights were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts on this fully documented historic district.

- Designated St. Francis Wood National Register Historic District No. 100007846 was listed on June 30, 2022. This historic district was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone could have significant impacts on this historic district.

- *The Gardens in the City; San Francisco Residence Parks, 1906-1940, Historic Context Statement* identified 8 residence parks neighborhoods as eligible historic districts. Since this was last heard by the Historic Preservation Commission in April 2021, St. Francis Wood has been listed on the National Register of Historic Place No. 100007846 and Ingleside Terraces has been fully documented as a National Register Historic District and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office. Six other neighborhoods Jordan Park, West Clay Park, Forest Hill and Forest Hill Extension, Sea Cliff, Lincoln Manor and

Balboa Terrace are identified as potential historic districts. These six neighborhoods would be impacted by upzoning in and along the edges.

- Historic Category "A" rated buildings across the city would be impacted by the Rezone as it affords no protection for these previously identified, but not designated historic resources. The City of San Francisco Planning Department has previously required full Historic Resource Evaluations for projects involving Category "A" rated buildings. This policy change was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

**The following landmarks and contributors to historic districts designated pursuant to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code may be removed from the Upzone by a pending amendment to the Upzone legislation:**

- Designated Telegraph Hill Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this entire Historic District, which was not in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Designated Alamo Square Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes most of this Historic District, including increased heights from 40 feet to 50 feet along Scott Street. This District was not in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to the District.
- Designated Webster Street Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this entire Historic District, which was not in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Haslett Warehouse, both National Register No. 75000172 and Article 10 Landmark No. 57 (680 Beach Street; Parcel 0010/002). he Rezone includes this parcel, owned by the United States National Park Service, upzoning it from its existing height of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated San Francisco Art Institute Article 10 Landmark No 85 including the Diego Rivera Gallery Landmark No 284 (800 Chestnut Street; Parcel 0049/001). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height of 40 feet to 50 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Ghiradelli Square, both National Register No. 82002249 and Article 10 Landmark No. 36 (920 North Point; Parcel 0452/002). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Goodman Building/Emeric Building, both National Register No. 75000473 and Article 10 Landmark No. 71 (1117 Geary Blvd; Parcel 0714/018). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 650 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 260 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or

other State programs that provide density or development bonuses. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 650 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated First Unitarian Church Article 10 Landmark No. 40 (1187 Franklin Street; Parcel 0713/034). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and, as the density is form-based, use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be encouraged. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 650 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Earl C. Anthony Packard Showroom Article 10 Landmark No. 153 (901 Van Ness Avenue; Parcel 0719/002). The parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and, as the density is form-based, use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be encouraged. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 500 feet and 350 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Don Lee Auto Showroom, both National Register No. 01001179 and Article 10 Landmark No.152 (1000 Van Ness Avenue; Parcel 0715/014). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and as the density is form-based, use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be encouraged. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 500 feet and 650 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Stradtmuller House, both National Register No. 76000523 and Article 10 Landmark No. 35 (819 Eddy Street; Parcel 0743/015). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 300 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 350 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Engine Company Number 31 Fire House Article 10 Landmark No. 220 (1088 Green St (0121/010). This parcel is now within the Rezone but was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic building.

- Designated Clay Theater Article 10 Landmark No. 302 (2261 Fillmore Street; Parcel 0630/002). This parcel and area of Fillmore Street are rezoned from their existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and this could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 65 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Designated Calvary Presbyterian Church National Register No 78000755 and Article 10 Landmark No. 103 (2501 Fillmore Street; Parcel 0587/027). This parcel and area of Fillmore are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Grace Cathedral Article 10 Landmark No. 170 (1100 California Street; Parcel 0246/001). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Chambord Apartments, both Article 10 Landmark No. 106 and National Register No. 84001184 (1298 Sacramento Street; Parcel 0221/125). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Old Flood Mansion, Pacific Union Club, both Article 10 Landmark No. 64 and National Register No. 66000230 (1000 California Street; Parcel 0245/001). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Westfield House Article 10 Landmark No. 135 (1198 Fulton Street, Parcel 0777/015) located in the Alamo Square Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. The Rezone could result in significant impacts to this historic site and the Alamo Square Historic District.
- Designated Third Baptist Church Complex Article 10 Landmark No. 275 (1399 McAllister Street, Parcel 0778/013). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. The Rezone could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Archbishop's Mansion Article 10 Landmark No. 151 (1000 Fulton Street, Parcel 0778/006) located in the Alamo Square Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone could result in significant impacts to this historic site and the Alamo Square Historic District.
-

- Designated Abner Phelps House, both National Register No. 71000187 and Article 10 Landmark No. 32 (1111 Oak Street; Parcel 1218/050). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Sarah Mish House, both National Register No. 79000534 and Article 10 Landmark No. 62 (1153 Oak Street; Parcel 1218/029). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Firehouse Engine Company No. 2, both Article 10 Landmark No. 89 (1152 Oak Street, Parcel 1215/010) and a contributor to the Buena Vista North Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. The inclusion of this parcel in the Rezone was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned 65 feet and 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Richard Doolan/Norman Larson Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 253 (557 Ashbury Street, Parcel 1231/009). As the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 65 feet with form-based density and rezoned to RTO-C, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Theodore Green Apothecary Article 10 Landmark No. 182 (500 Divisadero Street, Parcel 1203/017A). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Charles L. Hinkel House and Carriage House Article 10 Landmark No. 190 (280 Divisadero Street; Parcel 1238/023). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Old Saint Patrick's Church Article 10 Landmark No. 6 (1820 Eddy Street, Parcel 1127/007A). This parcel now included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-3 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing

Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 65 feet with form-based density and rezoned to RTO-C, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Glazer-Keating House Article 10 Landmark No. 251 (1110 Taylor Street, Parcel 0222/018). The Rezone now includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Merryvale Antiques (S.F. Gas Light Co.) Article 10 Landmark No 58 (3640 Buchanan Street, Parcel 0459/003) This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol). The Rezone now includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Ladies Protection and Relief Society Article 10 Landmark No 320 ( 3400 Laguna Street, Parcel 0471/003). The Rezone now includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Blackstone Court Article 10 Historic District (30 Blackstone Court, 1545 Lombard Street, and 1549 Lombard Street (Parcels 0504/003, 0504/003H & 0504/019). The Rezone increases the height of two of the parcels in this District from 40 feet to140 feet and the density is changed to form-based. This Historic District was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 140 feet with form-based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- North End Police Station and Garage Article 10 Landmark No. 218 (2475 Greenwich, Parcel 0513/015). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Filbert Street Cottages Article 10 Landmark No 232 (1338 Lombard Street, Parcel 0524/031). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Metro Theater Article 10 Landmark No 261 (2055 Union Street, Parcel 0541/018. The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This site was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- The Colonial Dames (McElroy) Octagon House Article 10 Landmark No. 17 and National Register No 720000250 (2645 Gough Street, Parcels 0544/001 and 0544/001C. This historic site, included in the Upzone, is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet and its density changed to form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Alhambra Theater Article 10 Landmark No. 21 (2320-366 Polk Street, Parcel 0548/022). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 to 85 and now form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- The Burr Mansion Article 10 Landmark No.31 and National Register #14000967 (1772 Vallejo Street, Parcel 0552/029). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Golden Gate Valley Carnegie Library Article 10 Landmark No. 300 (1801 Green Street, Parcel 0554/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Casebolt House Article 10 Landmark No 51 (2727 Pierce Street, Parcel 0560/005). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Church For The Fellowship of All People Article 10 Landmark No. 309 (2041 Larkin Street, Parcel 0572/003). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Engine Company No. 8 Truck No. 4 Article 10 Landmark No. 188 (1648 Pacific St., Parcel 0574/011). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 350 feet. This extreme upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 350 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Talbot-Dutton House Article 10 Landmark No. 57 (2200 Franklin/1782 Pacific Avenue, Parcel 0575/010). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet, its density is changed form-based, and rezoned from residential to RTO-C. This extreme rezoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 240 feet to 350 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- St. Brigid's Church Article 10 Landmark No. 252 (2151 Van Ness Avenue, Parcel 575/015). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 80 feet to 350. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 240 feet to 350 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Bourne Mansion Article 10 Landmark No 38 (2550 Webster Street, Parcel 0580/013). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet, and rezoned from residential to RTO-C. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 65 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Leale House Article 10 Landmark No. 45 (2475 Pacific Avenue, Parcel 0587/018). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Whittier Mansion Article 10 Landmark No. 75 and National Register No 76000524 (2090 Jackson St, Parcel 0591/007). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Haas-Lilienthal House Article 10 Landmark No. 69 and National Register No 730000438 (2007 Franklin St. 0600/002). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Spreckels Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 197 (2080 Washington Street, Parcel 0601/005. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Sacred Heart Parish Complex Article 10 Landmark No.316 and National Register 10000112 (660 Oak Street, Parcel 0828/012; 735 Fell Street, Parcel 0828/022A; 554 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/22; and 546-548 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/21). The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Market Street Masonry Historic District Article 10 Historic District and listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (7 non-contiguous historic buildings on Market Street Between Franklin Street and Valencia Street, including Parcels 3504/038, 3504/040, 3504/046, 3504/001, 0854/004 and 0854/005, and the Miramar Apartments at 1582 Market Street, Parcel 0836/010. The Rezone includes the parcels in this District, which are upzoned from their existing height limit of 85 feet to 140 feet. Even if these parcels are removed from the Upzone, because they are surrounded by parcels rezoned to 140 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Health Sciences Library Article 10 Landmark No. 115 (2395 Sacramento Street, Parcel 0637/016). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- William Vale House Article 10 Landmark No. 168 (2226 California Street, Parcel 0637/040). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet, and the density is changed to form-based. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Chambers Mansion Article 10 Landmark No.119 (2220-2222 Sacramento Street, Parcel 0627/054). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Richard E. Queen House Article 10 Landmark No. 198 (2212 Sacramento Street, Parcel 0627/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Atherton House Article 10 Landmark No. 70 and National Register No. 79000527 (1990 California Street, Parcel 0640/010). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet, and rezoned from residential to RTO-C. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Isaac Wormser House/John C. Coleman House Article 10 Landmark No. 53 (1834 California Street, Parcel 0641/005). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Lilienthal-Orville Pratt House Article 10 Landmark No. 55 (1818-1820 California Street, Parcel 0641/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Golden Gate Commandery of the Knights Templar (Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church Article 10 Landmark No. 202 (2135 Sutter Street, Parcel 0682/006). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 50 feet to 85 feet and is now form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Richardson Hall Article 10 Landmark Nos. 256, 257, and 258 (55 Laguna Street, Parcel 0870/001). The Rezone includes these Landmarks, which are upzoned from their existing height limits to 85 feet and their density has been changed to form-based. These buildings were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Carmel Fallon Building Article 10 Landmark No. 223 and Contributor to the designated Hayes Valley Residential Historic District listed on the California Register of Historic Resources (1800-1806 Market Street, Parcel 0871/014). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 85 feet to 120 feet and its density has been changed to form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone,

because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 140 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Roos Residence both Article 10 Landmark No. 56 and National Register 09000805 (3500 Jackson Street, Parcel 0970/002). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Ellingwood House Article 10 Landmark No. 207 (2799 Pacific Ave, Parcel 0978/010) and within the California Register eligible Presidio Heights Historic District. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Koshland House Article 10 Landmark No. 95 and National Register No. 84001186, within the CA eligible Presidio Heights Historic District. (3800 Washington, Parcel 0989/028). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Ortman-Shumate House Article 10 Landmark No. 98 (1901 Scott Street, Parcel 1027/003). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Theodore Roosevelt Jr. High School Article 10 Landmark No. 285 (460 Arguello Street, Parcel 1061/049). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- San Francisco Memorial Columbarium Article 10 Landmark No. 209 (1 Loraine Court, Parcel 1084/002).The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Clunie House Article 10 Landmark No. 128 (301 Lyon Street, Parcel 1207/008). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Alfred G. Hanson Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 196 (128 27th Avenue, Parcel 1332/049). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- St. John's Presbyterian Church Article 10 Landmark No. 83 (201 Arguello Boulevard, Parcel 1361/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Campfire Girls Building Article 10 Landmark No. 169 (325 Arguello Boulevard), Parcel 1432/003). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Richmond Branch Library Article 10 Landmark No. 247 (351 9th Avenue, Parcel 1441/007). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Refugee Shack Article 10 Landmark No. 171 (1227 24th Avenue, Parcel 1726/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Doelger Building Article 10 Landmark No.265 (320-26 Judah Street, Parcel 1763/020). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet and its density has been changed to form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Old Fire House Article 10 Landmark No.29 (1348 10th Avenue, Parcel 1764/031). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Sunset Branch Library Article 10 Landmark No. 239 (1305-49 18th Street, Parcel 1773/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 65, 85 and 140 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children Article 10 Landmark No.221 (1601 19th Avenue, Parcel 1924/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- San Francisco Conservatory of Music Article 10 Landmark No. 242 (1201 Ortega Street, Parcel 2115/037). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- The McCormick House Article 10 Landmark No. 208 (4040-4042 17th Street, Parcel 2623/012). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 120 feet, its density is changed form-based, and it is rezoned from residential to RTO-C. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 140 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Alfred E. (Nobby) Clarke Mansion Article 10 Landmark No. 80 (250 Douglass St., Parcel 2700/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Miller-Joost House Article 10 Landmark No. 79 (3224 Market Street, Parcel 2704/040). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- David Lewis House Article 10 Landmark No.186 (4143 23rd Street, Parcel 2804/040). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- 171 San Marcos Avenue (aka Cowell House) Article 10 Landmark No. 270 (171 San Marcos Avenue, Parcel 2882/035). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- El Rey Theater Article 10 Landmark No.274 (1970 Ocean Avenue, Parcel 3280/018). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Juvenile Court and Detention Center Article 10 Landmark No. 248 (170 Otis Street, Parcel 3513/207). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 125 feet to 160 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- 396-398 12th Street (aka San Francisco Eagle Bar) Article 10 Landmark No. 295 (396-398 12th Street, Parcel 3522/014). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 55 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Saint Francis Lutheran Church Article 10 Landmark No. 39 (152 Church Street, Parcel 3537010). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Swedish American Hall Building Article 10 Landmark No. 267 (2168-2174 Market Street, Parcel 3542/062). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40-50 feet to 120 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 120 feet and 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- 2117-2123 Market Street (aka New Era Hall) Article 10 Landmark No. 277 (2117-2123 Market Street, Parcel 3543/012). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40-50 feet to 120 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 120 feet and 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- 22 Beaver Street (aka Benedict-Gieling House) Article 10 Landmark No. 284 (22 Beaver Street, Parcel 3561060). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- The Jose Theater/Names Project Building Article 10 Landmark No. 241 (2362 Market Street, Parcel 3562/011). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 120 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the

Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 120 feet and 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Mission Dolores Article 10 Landmark No. 1 and National Register No.72000251 (310-20 Dolores Street, Parcel 3566/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Mission High School Article 10 Landmark No. 255 (3750 18th Street, Parcel 3579/006). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Twin Peaks Tavern Article 10 Landmark No. 264 (3997 17th Street, Parcel 3582/071). The Rezone includes this parcel as being upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 160 feet and its density is changed to form-based. While this site was included in the 2022 Housing Element and the 2022 EIR as upzoned to 85 feet, the Rezone upzones it to 160 feet. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Castro Theater Article 10 Landmark No. 100 (429-431 Castro Street, Parcel 3582/085). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 85 feet and its density is changed to form-based. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is adjacent to parcels rezoned to 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Castro Camera Article 10 Landmark No. 227 (573-75 Castro Street, Parcel 3583/061). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Axford House Article 10 Landmark No. 133 (1190 Noe Street, Parcel 6538/048). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Carnegie Noe Valley/Sally Brunn Branch Library Article 10 Landmark No. 259 (451 Jersey Street, Parcel 6539/034). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- 651 Duncan Street (aka Lyon-Martin House) Article 10 Landmark No. 292 (651 Duncan Street, Parcel 6604/036). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Sunnyside Conservatory Article 10 Landmark No. 78 (236 Monterey Blvd, Parcel 6770/057). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Joseph Leonard/Cecil F. Poole House Article 10 Landmark No. 213 (90 Cedro Avenue, Parcel 6908/016). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- 1345 Ocean Ave (aka Ingleside Presbyterian Church and the Great Cloud of Witnesses) Article 10 Landmark No. 273 (1345 Ocean Avenue, Parcel 6942/050). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 50 feet to 85 feet.

- This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Sherman House Article 10 Landmark No. 49 (2160 Green Street, Parcels 0540/030 and 0540/028). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Gibbs Residence and Caretaker's Cottage Article 10 Landmark 203 (2622-24 Jackson Street and 2624-29 Pacific Avenue, Parcels 0585/008, 0585/009 and 0585/010). The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
  .
- Southern Pacific Co. Hospital Complex Article 10 Landmark No. 192 and National Register 89000319 (1400-1599 Fell Street & 1509-1599 Hayes Street, Parcels 1206/002 and 1206/003). Also within the Panhandle Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Edward Coleman House Article 10 Landmark No. 54 (1701 Franklin Street, Parcels 0641/014 and 0641/015). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Duboce Park Article 10 Historic District, is proposed for removal from the Rezone except for the contributory buildings located along Waller and Steiner Streets are proposed to be rezoned RTO-1, remaining in the Rezone. This Historic District was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

**Attachment 2: North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District Parcel Analysis Within Rezone**
**November 30, 2025**
**Compiled by Bridget Maley, architecture + history, llc**

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 490 Lombard St | 0062017B | 1926 | C |
| 1916-18 Stockton St | 0062017C | 1940 | C |
| 1922-24 Stockton St | 0062017D | 1940 | C |
| 1934-36 Stockton St | 0062017E | 1940 | C |
| 1946-48 Stockton St | 0062019 | 1908 | C |
| 1952-56 Stockton St | 0062020 | 1908 | C |
| 1958-60 Stockton St | 0062021 | 1906 | C |
| 379-99 Chestnut St/1952-56 Stockton | 0062022 | 1906 | C |
| 1940 Stockton St | 0062052-058 | 1980 | NC |
| 401 Chestnut St/1957-61 Stockton | 0063001 | c. 1906 | C |
| 1951-55 Stockton St | 0063002 | 1906 | C |
| 1943-47 Stockton St | 0063003 | 1907 | C |
| 1935-41 Stockton St | 0063004 | 1907 | C |
| 1929-33 Stockton St | 0063005 | 1907 | C |
| 1923-25 Stockton St | 0063006 | 1908 | C |
| 1915-17 Stockton St | 0063007 | 1907 | C |
| 1901-05 Stockton St | 0063009 | 1906 | C |
| 520-24 Lombard St | 0063010 | 1911 | C |
| 526-30 Lombard St | 0063011 | 1909 | C |
| 532-36 Lombard St | 0063012 | 1912 | C |
| 538-42 Lombard St | 0063013 | 1912 | C |
| 544-46 Lombard St | 0063014 | 1916 | C |
| 548 Lombard St | 0063015 | 1926 | NC |
| 566-76 Lombard St | 0063017 | 1908 | C |
| 590-94 Lombard St | 0063018 | 1925 | C |
| 2006-08 Powell St | 0063018A | 1924 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2018-20 Powell St | 0063018C | 1924 | NC |
| 2024-30 Powell St | 0063019 | 1906 | C |
| 2038-40 Powell St | 0063021 | 1956 | NC |
| 2044-48 Powell St | 0063022 | 1909 | C |
| 2050-64 Powell St | 0063023 | 1907 | C |
| 475 Chestnut St | 0063024 | 1946 | C |
| 461-67 Chestnut St | 0063025 | c. 1907 | C |
| 455-59 Chestnut St | 0063025A | 1908 | C |
| 449-53 Chestnut St | 0063026 | 1912 | C |
| 443-47 Chestnut St | 0063027 | 1908 | C |
| 437-41 Chestnut St | 0063027A | 1908 | C |
| 427 Chestnut St | 0063028 | 1932 | C |
| 421-23 Chestnut St | 0063029 | 1907 | C |
| 1907-13 Stockton St | 0063030-033 | 1906 | C |
| 560-64A Lombard St | 0063034-036 & 16A | 1907 | C |
| 2032-34 Powell St | 0063037-038 | 1912 | C |
| 2061-65 Powell St | 0064001 | 1906 | C |
| 2055-59 Powell St | 0064002 | 1908 | C |
| 2049-53 Powell St | 0064003 | 1909 | C |
| 2043-47 Powell St | 0064004 | 1909 | C |
| 2035-41 Powell St | 0064005 | 1909 | C |
| 2027-31 Powell St | 0064006 | 1907 | C |
| 2017-21 Powell St | 0064007 | 1912 | C |
| 602-04 Lombard St | 0064009 | 1926 | C |
| 616-18 Lombard St | 0064032 | 1922 | C |
| 2011-15 Powell St | 0064033-035 | c. 1912 | C |
| 513-19 Lombard St | 0076001 | 1917 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1847-57 Stockton St | 0076003 | 1910 | C |
| 1843 Stockton St | 0076004 | 1906 | NC |
| 1815-25 Stockton St | 0076006 | 1907 | C |
| 1807-09 Stockton St | 0076007 | 1907 | C |
| 1801-03 Stockton St | 0076008 | 1908 | C |
| 622-24 Greenwich St | 0076009 | 1908 | C |
| 628-30 Greenwich St | 0076010 | 1908 | C |
| 638-42 Greenwich St & 632A Greenwich | 0076011 | 1906 | C |
| 644-46 Greenwich St | 0076012 | 1925 | C |
| 652-56 Greenwich St | 0076013 | 1906 | C |
| 658-64 Greenwich St | 0076014 | 1907 | C |
| 666-76 Greenwich St | 0076015 | 1906 | C |
| 678-80 Greenwich St | 0076016 | 1906 | C |
| 1906 Powell St & 690-92 Greenwich | 0076017 | 1923 | C |
| 1918-22 Powell St | 0076020 | 1906 | C |
| 1930-34 Powell St | 0076022 | 1912 | C |
| 1936-38 Powell St | 0076023 | 1906 | C |
| 1942-46 Powell St | 0076024 | 1912 | C |
| 1948-54 Powell St | 0076025 | 1914 | C |
| 1956-66 Powell St | 0076025A | 1914 | C |
| 585-87 Lombard St | 0076025B | 1908 | C |
| 567-79 Lombard St | 0076026 | 1914 | C |
| 563-65 Lombard St | 0076027 | 1906 | C |
| 551-61 Lombard St | 0076027A | 1914 | C |
| 547-49 Lombard St | 0076028 | 1913 | C |
| 537-39 Lombard St | 0076030 | 1907 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Tuscany Alley | 0076032 | 1906 | C |
| 529-31 Lombard St | 0076033 | 1925 | C |
| 525-27 Lombard St | 0076033A | 1925 | C |
| 543-45 Lombard St | 0076034-035 | 1925 | C |
| 1839-41 Stockton St | 0076054-055 | c. 2014 | NC |
| 1924-26 Powell St | 0076056-057 | 1922 | C |
| 1865-76 Stockton St | 0076058-059 | 1906 | C |
| 5-11 Edith St/1721-25 Grant | 0077008 | 1913 | C |
| 1707-09 Grant Ave | 0077009 | 1907 | NC |
| 1703-05 Grant Ave | 0077010 | 1909 | NC |
| 500-12 Greenwich St | 0077011 | 1908 | C |
| 514-16 Greenwich St & 15-17 Edith | 0077012 | 1924 | C |
| 520-22 Greenwich St & 19-21 Edith | 0077013 | 1910 | C |
| 528-30 Greenwich St & 25-27 Edith | 0077014 | 1909 | C |
| 532-34 Greenwich St | 0077015 | 1908 | C |
| 540 Greenwich St & 33-35 Edith | 0077016 | 1931 | C |
| 544-46 Greenwich St & 43-45 Edith | 0077017 | 1912 | C |
| 550-52 Greenwich St & 49-51 Edith | 0077018 | 1912 | C |
| 558-60 Greenwich St | 0077019 | 1911 | C |
| 562-64 Greenwich St | 0077020 | 1908 | C |
| 568-70 Greenwich St | 0077021 | 1908 | C |
| 586-90 Greenwich St | 0077023 | 1908 | C |
| 1800-04 Stockton St | 0077023A | 1907 | C |
| 1814 Stockton St | 0077024 | 1966 | C |
| 1816-20 Stockton St | 0077025 | 1911 | C |
| 1822-26 Stockton St | 0077026 | 1915 | C |
| 1828-32 Stockton St | 0077027 | 1914 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1848 Stockton St | 0077030 | 1907 | C |
| 1852-56 Stockton St | 0077031 | 1906 | C |
| 1858-60 Stockton St | 0077032 | 1914 | C |
| 1864-66 Stockton St | 0077032A | 1915 | C |
| 576-80 Greenwich St | 0077049-051 | 1997 | NC |
| 1840-44 Stockton St | 0077052-054 | 1911 | C |
| 1653-67 Grant Ave | 0088001 | 1908 | C |
| 1647-51 Grant Ave | 0088002 | 1908 | C |
| 1639-45 Grant Ave | 0088003 | 1913 | C |
| 1635-37 Grant Ave | 0088004 | 1908 | C |
| 12-26 Medau Place & 1615-33 Grant | 0088005 | 1908 | C |
| 1601 Grant Ave | 0088006 | 1965 | NC |
| 540-50 Filbert St & 51-61 Medau | 0088009 | 1909 | C |
| 552-56 Filbert St & 63-65 Medau | 0088010 | 1906 | C |
| 558-62A Filbert St | 0088011 | 1907 | C |
| 566 Filbert St | 0088012 | c. 1907 | C |
| 570-74 Filbert St & 12-18 Krausgrill | 0088013 | 1907 | C |
| 579-81 Greenwich St | 0088023 | 1908 | C |
| 561 Greenwich St | 0088025 | 1961 | C |
| 551-57 Greenwich St | 0088026 | 1911 | C |
| 547-49 Greenwich St | 0088027 | 1911 | C |
| 533-57 Greenwich St | 0088029 | 1912 | C |
| 517-23 Greenwich St | 0088031 | 1912 | C |
| 1-3 Kramer Place | 0088034 | 1910 | C |
| 577 Greenwich St | 0088036 | 1909 | C |
| 567-69 Greenwich St | 0088037 | 1906 | C |
| 19-33 Medau Place | 0088041-048 | 1909 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 526-30 Filbert St | 0088052-054 | 1912 | C |
| 532-36 Filbert St | 0088055-057 | c. 1986 | NC |
| 539-45 Greenwich St | 0088058-061 | 1913 | C |
| 525-31 Greenwich St | 0088071-072 | 1914 | C |
| 7-9 Kramer Place | 0088073-074 | 1910 | C |
| 608-20 Filbert St | 0089011 | 1951 | C |
| 622-26 Filbert St | 0089013 | 1913 | C |
| 630-34 Filbert St | 0089014 | 1910 | C |
| 650-60 Filbert St | 0089015 | 1912-1939 | C |
| 666 Filbert St | 0089016 | 1917 | C |
| 673-77 Greenwich St | 0089022A | 1915 | C |
| 667-71 Greenwich St | 0089022B | 1914 | NC |
| 695-99 Greenwich St | 0089022C | 1925 | C |
| 659-59BGreenwich St | 0089024 | 1907/2002 | C/NC |
| 651-55 Greenwich St | 0089025 | 1908 | C |
| 643 Greenwich St | 0089026 | 1907 | C |
| 637-41 Greenwich St | 0089027 | 1911 | C |
| 637A-641A Greenwich St | 0089027 | unknown | C |
| 619-21 Greenwich St | 0089029 | 1961 | C |
| 1856-60 Powell St | 0089031-036 | 1934 | C |
| 625-27 Greenwich St | 0089038 | 1908 | C |
| 631A-C Greenwich St | 0089039-041 | 1983 | NC |
| 1850-52 Powell St | 0089042-043 | 1933 | C |
| 661-65 Greenwich St | 0089044-046 | 1906 | C |
| 680 Filbert St | 0089048-049 | 1971 | NC |
| 690 Filbert St | 0089050-051 | 1961 | NC |

# EXHIBIT C

Shawn Smallwood, PhD
3108 Finch Street
Davis, CA 95616

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

24 October 2025

RE: San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR Addendum

Dear Mr. Drury,

I write to comment on potential impacts on biological resources from the proposed Addendum to the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). The FEIR, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and later signed by the Mayor on 31 January 2023, evaluated the impacts on the environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update. According to the Addendum, the FEIR anticipated "future actions, such as San Francisco Planning Code … amendments, designation of housing sustainability districts, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update." The Addendum characterizes the proposed actions as "reasonably foreseeable changes," and states that its purpose "is to evaluate the environmental impacts of the rezoning program and document the San Francisco Planning Department's … determination that these impacts are adequately addressed in the FEIR." I am concerned that the proposed actions in the Addendum have not been adequately addressed, and that the action's impacts on wildlife would be excessive and highly significant.

My qualifications for preparing expert comments are the following. I hold a Ph.D. degree in Ecology from University of California at Davis, where I also worked as a post-graduate researcher in the Department of Agronomy and Range Sciences. My research has been on animal density and distribution, habitat selection, wildlife interactions with the anthrosphere, and conservation of rare and endangered species. I authored many papers on these and other topics. I served as Chair of the Conservation Affairs Committee for The Wildlife Society – Western Section. I am a member of The Wildlife Society and Raptor Research Foundation, and I've lectured part-time at California State University, Sacramento. I was Associate Editor of wildlife biology's premier scientific journal, The Journal of Wildlife Management, as well as of Biological Conservation, and I was on the Editorial Board of Environmental Management. I have performed wildlife surveys in California for thirty-seven years. My CV is attached.

## POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON THE WILDLIFE COMMUNITY

The Addendum claims that the FEIR's analysis of wildlife impacts potentially caused by the originally planned 50,000 residential units have already addressed the impacts of the additionally proposed of 4,000 residential units. It further claims that the change in

outlay of the height and density of the originally planned 50,000 residential units are irrelevant to the analysis of potential impacts on wildlife. Deemed in no need of additional environmental review is the planned addition of 4,000 residential units, major shifts in the spatial distribution of the original 50,000 units, and increases in maximum building heights from 300 feet to 650 feet.

The Addendum (p. 48) points out that the FEIR had determined that future development associated with the adopted housing element would not adversely affect candidate, sensitive, or special-status species or sensitive natural communities, nor would it interfere with wildlife movement. I disagree with these determinations as they applied to the originally planned 50,000 residential units, as these determinations were simply not credible in the face of this much change to the environment. Here and now the City attempts to extend these same claims to the development associated with an additional 4,000 residential units and to substantial shifts in the spatial and vertical outlay of all 54,000 residential units.

One rationalization for the determinations was that special-status species such as peregrine falcon are adapted to the structural environment of San Francisco. Another was that compliance with existing state and federal regulations would ensure less-than-significant impacts to nesting birds. And for bats, the rationale was that compliance with the open space element of the general plan (Chapter 8 of the San Francisco Environment Code), would avoid potential impacts. These rationalizations, however, were speculative, having cited no evidence in their support. There was no citation of any comparative study of peregrine falcon population performance within the City versus in natural areas. There was no citation of monitoring data that would support the notion that existing state and federal regulations have been preventing significant impacts to nesting birds in the face of development pressure. There was no citation of monitoring data that would support the notion that Chapter 8 of the San Francisco Environment Code has managed to avoid development impacts on bats. Instead of relying on scientific inference, each argument leading to less-than-significant impact determinations was speculative. And this same strategy is carried forward in the Addendum with respect to the added 4,000 residential units and the changes in lateral and vertical outlay.

In fact, the evidence is overwhelming that overall bird abundance is on the decline, having declined 29% across North America over the past half-century (Rosenberg et al. 2019). In fact, all but three of the bat species in California are special-status species, indicating that bats as a taxonomic group are of serious conservation concern in California. And in fact, along with my co-investigator I have measured substantial declines in birds and special-status species as results of development projects (Smallwood and Smallwood 2023). The Addendum selects Peregrine falcon as an anecdote to imply that all birds simply adapt to the cityscape, but even the Peregrine falcon is vulnerable to window collisions. As another anecdote to the Addendum's, I happened to be in a meeting with attorneys of the California Attorney General's Office and agents with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service when we observed a Peregrine falcon nearly collide with our 14$^{th}$ story window as it chased after a rock pigeon in Oakland. And yet another anecdote from a few years ago, a Peregrine falcon fledgling fatally

collided with a window on the same UC Berkely building where it attempted its first flight from the nest. Peregrine falcons are vulnerable to window collision mortality just like any other bird, and perhaps even more so.

The Addendum does not consider the potential loss and fragmentation of the aerosphere in which these species travel and forage. The aerosphere is that part of the gaseous atmosphere where birds and bats and other volant animals with wings migrate, disperse, forage, perform courtship and where some of them mate (Davy et al. 2017, Diehl et al. 2017). Nor does the Addendum give any consideration to the potential loss and fragmentation of aerohabitat, which is that portion of the aerosphere used by each species (Kunz et al. 2008), and usually within 1,000 feet of the ground. Although both the peregrine falcon and bats often take prey on the ground, these animals are known for taking prey largely on the wing. These animals hunt other volant wildlife, which means that both these hunters and their prey perform vital life functions and interact with each other within the aerosphere. As for nesting birds, there would be no nesting birds without the birds' access to the aerosphere. Despite the vital importance of the aerosphere to peregrine falcons, nesting birds, and to bats, the Addendum fails to recognize the aerosphere as essential habitat to volant wildlife.

The Addendum does recognize that the new buildings would pose barriers to movement and collision hazards to birds. At page 49, the Addendum warns, "Changes to building heights could result in new impacts on migratory species if they result in flight paths being obstructed, more bird strikes, or impacts on falcon nesting habitat." The Addendum then dismisses these potential impacts by citing the adoption in the Aesthetics section of the FEIR of planning code section 139's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings. However, there exist major logic problems with this purported solution. First, the standards for bird-safe buildings do not avoid the barrier effects of buildings, and in fact the strategic objective of bird-safe building guidelines is to increase the visibility of buildings as barriers to bird movement so that birds less often collide with the structural glass on the exteriors of the buildings. Second, the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, while meritorious as a first step toward reducing bird-window collision mortality, are of unmeasured efficacy. While it is great that the City adopted the Bird-Safe Guidelines, the City has yet to follow up with any study of whether or to what degree the Standards truly minimize or reduce bird-window collision mortality. In the face of this uncertainty, the additional 4,000 residential units, greater building heights, and revised spatial distribution could result in significantly larger numbers of collision fatalities compared to the 2022 plan, despite implementation of the City's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.

In my assessment, there are 147 special-status species of wildlife documented near enough to the project site to warrant a closer look at their occurrence likelihoods for the purpose of predicting potential project impacts (Table 1). Of these 147 special-status species, 14 are bats that, if they truly occur where construction would take place, would be at risk of losing aerohabitat in which they travel and forage. Another 112 special-status species of wildlife would be birds, 49 of which have been documented throughout the project area, eight of which are known to be centrally located, six are known to Golden Gate Park or Lake Merced, and 19 of which have been documented as generally

coastal. All these bird species would be vulnerable to collision mortality and greater expenditures of indispensable energy to negotiate the structural hazards of another 4,000 residential units and the reallocation of vertical building heights across the planning area.

All the birds represented in Table 1 can quickly fly from wherever they have been documented to any of the new buildings that would be part of the added project, so they would all be within brief flights to the proposed project's windows. At the California Academy of Sciences, the glass facades facing adjacent gardens killed 0.077 and 0.086 birds per $m^2$ of glass per year (Kahle et al. 2016), which might look like small numbers at first read, but which translate to large numbers of dead birds when projected to the extent of glass in the project (see below).

Window collisions are often characterized as either the second or third largest source or human-caused bird mortality. The numbers behind these characterizations are often attributed to Klem's (1990) and Dunn's (1993) estimates of about 100 million to 1 billion bird fatalities in the USA, or more recently by Loss et al.'s (2014) estimate of 365-988 million bird fatalities in the USA or Calvert et al.'s (2013) and Machtans et al.'s (2013) estimates of 22.4 million and 25 million bird fatalities in Canada, respectively. The proposed project would impose windows in the airspace normally used by birds.

Glass-façades of buildings intercept and kill many birds, but they are differentially hazardous to birds based on spatial extent, contiguity, orientation, and other factors. At Washington State University, Johnson and Hudson (1976) found 266 bird fatalities of 41 species within 73 months of monitoring of a three-story glass walkway (no fatality adjustments attempted). Prior to marking the windows to warn birds of the collision hazard, the collision rate was 84.7 per year. At that rate, and not attempting to adjust the fatality estimate for the proportion of fatalities not found, 4,574 birds were likely killed over the 54 years since the start of their study, and that's at a relatively small building façade. Accounting for the proportion of fatalities not found, the number of birds killed by this walkway over the last 54 years would have been about 14,270. And this is just for one 3-story, glass-sided walkway between two college campus buildings.

Klem's (1990) estimate was based on speculation that 1 to 10 birds are killed per building per year, and this speculated range was extended to the number of buildings estimated by the US Census Bureau in 1986. Klem's speculation was supported by fatality monitoring at only two houses, one in Illinois and the other in New York. Also, the basis of his fatality rate extension has changed greatly since 1986. Whereas his estimate served the need to alert the public of the possible magnitude of the bird-window collision issue, it was highly uncertain at the time and undoubtedly outdated more than three decades hence. Indeed, by 2010 Klem (2010) characterized the upper end of his estimated range – 1 billion bird fatalities – as conservative. Furthermore, the estimate lumped species together as if all birds are the same and the loss of all birds to windows has the same level of impact.

***Table 1.*** *Occurrence likelihoods of special-status bird species at or near the proposed project site, according to eBird/iNaturalist records (https://eBird.org, https://www.inaturalist.org) and on-site survey findings, where 'Very close' indicates within 1.5 miles of the site, "nearby" indicates within 1.5 and 4 miles, and "in region" indicates within 4 and 30 miles, and 'in range' means the species' geographic range overlaps the site.*

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status**[1] | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Bruno elfin butterfly | *Callophrys mossii bayensis* | FE | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Monarch | *Danaus plexippus* | FC | On site | Throughout |
| Bay checkerspot butterfly | *Euphydryas editha bayensis* | FT | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Mission blue butterfly | *Icaricia icarioides missionensis* | FE | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Callippe silverspot butterfly | *Speyeria callippe callippe* | FE | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Myrtle's silverspot butterfly | *Speyeria zerene myrtleae* | FE | In region | |
| Crotch's bumble bee | *Bombus crotchii* | CCE | In region | |
| Western bumble bee | *Bombus occidentalis* | CCE | Very close | |
| Longfin smelt | *Spirinchus thaleichthys* | CT | In region | |
| Delta Smelt | *Hypomesus transpacificus* | FT, CE | In region | |
| Tidewater goby | *Eucyclogobius newberryi* | FE, SSC | In region | iNat obscured points |
| California giant salamander | *Dicamptodon ensatus* | SSC | In region | Obscured |
| Foothill yellow-legged frog | *Rana boylii* | FT, CE | In region | |
| California red-legged frog | *Rana draytonii* | FT, SSC | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Green sea turtle | *Chelonia mydas* | FT | In region | |
| Northwestern pond turtle | *Actinemys marmorata* | FC, SSC | On site | West and SW |
| San Francisco garter snake | *Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia* | FE, CE, CFP | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Brant | *Branta bernicla* | SSC2 | On site | West and NE, along shores |
| Cackling goose (Aleutian) | *Branta hutchinsii leucopareia* | WL | On site | Generally throughout |
| Redhead | *Aythya americana* | SSC2 | On site | North |
| Harlequin duck | *Histrionicus histrionicus* | SSC2 | Very close | Presidio |
| Barrow's goldeneye | *Bucephala islandica* | SSC | On site | NW |
| Short-tailed albatross | *Phoebastria albatrus* | FE, SSC | In region | |
| Fork-tailed storm petrel | | SSC | Very close | North and west shores |
| Ashy storm-petrel | *Hydrobates homochroa* | BCC, SSC | Very close | Lake Merced |
| Black storm-petrel | *Hydrobates melania* | SSC, BCC | Very close | NW corner of peninsula |
| Western grebe | *Aechmophorus occidentalis* | BCC | On site | Throughout |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clark's grebe | *Aechmophorus clarkii* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Western yellow-billed cuckoo | *Coccyzus americanus occidentalis* | FT, CE | In region | |
| Black swift | *Cypseloides niger* | SSC3, BCC | On site | Central |
| Vaux's swift | *Chaetura vauxi* | SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Calliope hummingbird | *Selasphorus calliope* | BCC | On site | Central/South |
| Rufous hummingbird | *Selasphorus rufus* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Allen's hummingbird | *Selasphorus sasin* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Yellow rail | *Coturnicops noveboracensis* | BCC, SSC | In region | |
| Ridgway's rail (San Francisco Bay) | *Rallus obsoletus obsoletus* | FE, CE, CFP | On site | North |
| California black rail | | | In range | |
| Black oystercatcher | *Haematopus bachmani* | BCC | On site | Throughout, mostly shoreines |
| Mountain plover | *Charadrius montanus* | SSC2, BCC | Very close | San Francisco Zoo |
| Snowy plover | *Charadrius nivosus* | BCC | On site | North and west shores, 1 central |
| Western snowy plover | *Charadrius nivosus nivosus* | FT, SSC | Very close | West along shore |
| Long-billed curlew | *Numenius americanus* | WL | On site | Throughout |
| Marbled godwit | *Limosa fedoa* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Black turnstone | *Arenaria melanocephala* | BCC | On site | Mostly along north, west shores |
| Red knot (Pacific) | *Calidris canutus* | BCC | On site | West along coast |
| Pectoral sandpiper | *Calidris melanotos* | BCC | Very close | Lake Merced and Presidio |
| Short-billed dowitcher | *Limnodromus griseus* | BCC | On site | West, North, and central |
| Wandering tattler | *Tringa incana* | BCC | On site | North and W, mostly shores |
| Lesser yellowlegs | *Tringa flavipes* | BCC | On site | North /central (Richmond) |
| Willet | *Tringa semipalmata* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Marbled murrelet | *Brachyramphus marmoratus* | FT, CE | On site | West and N/central (Richmond) |
| Rhinoceros auklet | *Cerorhinca monocerata* | WL | On site | North and W, along shores |
| Cassin's auklet | *Ptychoramphus aleuticus* | SSC | Very close | North and W of along shores |
| Scripps' murrelet | *Synthliboramphus scrippsi* | CT, BCC | Very close | NW of site along shore |
| Tufted puffin | | | Very close | West along shore |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laughing gull | *Leucophaeus atricilla* | WL | Very close | Presidio, West shore, Lake Merced |
| Franklin's gull | *Leucophaeus pipixcan* | BCC | Very close | West shore, Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced |
| Heermann's gull | *Larus heermanni* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Western gull | *Larus occidentalis* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| California gull | *Larus californicus* | BCC, WL | On site | Throughout |
| California least tern | *Sternula antillarum browni* | FE, CE, CFP | Very close | North and Lake Merced |
| Black tern | *Chlidonias niger* | SSC2, BCC | Very close | Golden Gate Park, North and west aspects |
| Elegant tern | *Thalasseus elegans* | BCC, WL | On site | Throughout |
| Black skimmer | *Rynchops niger* | BCC, SSC3 | On site | North shore |
| Common loon | *Gavia immer* | SSC | On site | Throughout |
| Brandt's cormorant | *Urile penicillatus* | BCC | On site | Throughout, mostly along North and west shores |
| Double-crested cormorant | *Phalacrocorax auritus* | WL | On site | Throughout |
| American white pelican | *Pelacanus erythrorhynchos* | SSC1 | On site | Throughout, mostly North, central |
| Least bittern | *Ixobrychus exilis* | SSC2 | Very close | Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced |
| White-faced ibis | *Plegadis chihi* | WL | On site | West side |
| Turkey vulture | *Cathartes aura* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Osprey | *Pandion haliaetus* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| White-tailed kite | *Elanus luecurus* | CFP, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Golden eagle | *Aquila chrysaetos* | BGEPA, CFP, BOP, WL | On site | Throughout, mostly central |
| Northern harrier | *Circus cyaneus* | BCC, SSC3, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Sharp-shinned hawk | *Accipiter striatus* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Cooper's hawk | *Accipiter cooperii* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| American goshawk | *Accipiter atricapillus* | SSC2, BOP | On site | North |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bald eagle | *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* | CE, BGEPA, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Red-shouldered hawk | *Buteo lineatus* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Swainson's hawk | *Buteo swainsoni* | CT, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Red-tailed hawk | *Buteo jamaicensis* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Ferruginous hawk | *Buteo regalis* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Rough-legged hawk | *Buteo lagopus* | BOP | On site | Central |
| American barn owl | *Tyto furcata* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Northern spotted owl | *Strix occidentalis caurina* | FT, CT, BOP | In range | |
| Western screech-owl | *Megascops kennicotti* | BOP | Very close | Presidio, Golden Gate Park |
| Great horned owl | *Bubo virginianus* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Burrowing owl | *Athene cunicularia* | BCC, SSC2, BOP, CCE | On site | Throughout |
| Long-eared owl | *Asio otus* | BCC, SSC3, BOP | In region | |
| Short-eared owl | *Asia flammeus* | BCC, SSC3, BOP | On site | Central |
| Northern saw-whet owl | *Aegolius acadicus* | BOP | On site | North |
| Northern pygmy-owl | *Glaucidium gnoma* | BOP | Very close | Lake Merced |
| Lewis's woodpecker | *Melanerpes lewis* | BCC | On site | North and central |
| Nuttall's woodpecker | *Picoides nuttallii* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| American kestrel | *Falco sparverius* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Merlin | *Falco columbarius* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Peregrine falcon | *Falco peregrinus* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Prairie falcon | *Falco mexicanus* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Olive-sided flycatcher | *Contopus cooperi* | BCC, SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Willow flycatcher | *Empidonax trailii* | CE | On site | Throughout |
| Vermilion flycatcher | *Pyrocephalus rubinus* | SSC2 | On site | North /central (Richmond) |
| Least Bell's vireo | *Vireo bellii pusillus* | FE, CE | In region | |
| Loggerhead shrike | *Lanius ludovicianus* | SSC2 | Very close | Presidio, Lake Merced, Golden Gate Park, SE of site |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yellow-billed magpie | *Pica nuttalli* | BCC | On site | Central/South |
| Oak titmouse | *Baeolophus inornatus* | BCC | On site | North and central |
| California horned lark | *Eremophila alpestris actia* | WL | On site | North and central |
| Bank swallow | *Riparia riparia* | CT | On site | Throughout |
| Purple martin | *Progne subis* | SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Wrentit | *Chamaea fasciata* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| California thrasher | *Toxostoma redivivum* | BCC | On site | N and central |
| Cassin's finch | *Haemorhous cassinii* | BCC | On site | N and central |
| Lawrence's goldfinch | *Spinus lawrencei* | BCC | On site | N and central |
| Grasshopper sparrow | *Ammodramus savannarum* | SSC2 | On site | N and central |
| Black-chinned sparrow | *Spizella atrogularis* | BCC | In region | |
| Bell's sparrow | *Amphispiza b. belli* | WL | On site | South |
| Large-billed savannah sparrow | *Passerculus sandwichensis rostratus* | SSC2 | In region | |
| Yellow-breasted chat | *Icteria virens* | SSC3 | On site | Throughout |
| Yellow-headed blackbird | *Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus* | SSC3 | On site | North and central |
| Bullock's oriole | *Icterus bullockii* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Tricolored blackbird | *Agelaius tricolor* | CT, BCC, SSC1 | On site | Throughout |
| Lucy's warbler | *Leiothlypis luciae* | SSC3 | On site | SW and North |
| Virginia's warbler | *Leiothlypis virginiae* | WL, BCC | On site | Throughout |
| San Francisco common yellowthroat | *Geothlypis trichas sinuosa* | SSC3, BCC | In range | |
| Prothonotary warbler | *Protonotaria citrea* | BCC | On site | Central and West |
| Prairie warbler | *Setophaga discolor* | BCC | On site | Central |
| Yellow warbler | *Setophaga petechia* | SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Hepatic tanager | *Piranga flava* | WL | On site | Central/South |
| Summer tanager | *Piranga rubra* | SSC1 | On site | Throughout |
| Little brown bat | *Myotis lucifugus* | WBWG: M | In region | |
| Yuma myotis | *Myotis yumanensis* | WBWG: LM | Very close | In golden gate park |

| Common name | *Species name* | Status[1] | Occurrence records | Locations of On-site and Very-close records |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Long-eared myotis | *Myotis evotis* | WBWG: M | In region | |
| Fringed myotis | *Myotis thysanodes* | WBWG: H | In range | |
| Long-legged myotis | *Myotis volans* | WBWG: H | In range | |
| California myotis | *Myotis californicus* | WBWG:L | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Canyon bat | *Parastrellus hesperus* | WBWG: M | In range | |
| Big brown bat | *Episticus fuscus* | WBWG: L | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Silver-haired bat | *Lasionycteris noctivagans* | WBWG: M | On site | North |
| Hoary bat | *Lasiurus cinereus* | WBWG: M | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Western red bat | *Lasiurus blossevillii* | SSC, WBWG: H | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Townsend's big-eared bat | *Corynorhinus townsendii* | SSC, WBWG: H | In region | |
| Pallid bat | *Antrozous pallidus* | SSC, WBWG: H | In region | |
| Mexican free-tailed bat | *Tadarida brasiliensis* | WBWG: L | Very close | Golden Gate Park |
| San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat | *Neotoma fuscipes annectens* | SSC | In region | |
| Southern sea otter | *nhydra lutris nereis* | FT, CFP, SSC | In region | |
| Salt-marsh harvest mouse | *Reithrodontomys raviventris* | FE, CE, CFP | In region | |
| American badger | *Taxidea taxus* | SSC | Nearby | |

[1] Listed on CDFW's Special Animals List (https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=109406) as FT or FE = federal threatened or endangered; FC = federal candidate for listing; BGEPA = Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act; CT or CE = California threatened or endangered; CCT or CCE = Candidate California threatened or endangered; CFP = California Fully Protected (California Fish and Game Code 3511); SSC = California Species of Special Concern, and SSC1, SSC2 and SSC3 = California Bird Species of Special Concern priorities 1, 2 and 3, respectively); WL = CDFW's Taxa to Watch List; WBWG = Western Bat Working Group with priority rankings, of low (L), moderate (M), and high (H); BCC = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Bird of Conservation Concern (https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/birds-of-conservation-concern-2021.pdf); and BOP = protected by Birds of Prey (California Fish and Game Code 3503.5, see https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Birds/Raptors).

By the time Loss et al. (2014) performed their effort to estimate annual USA bird-window fatalities, many more fatality monitoring studies had been reported or were underway. Loss et al. (2014) incorporated many more fatality rates based on scientific monitoring, and they were more careful about which fatality rates to include. However, they included estimates based on fatality monitoring by homeowners, which in one study were found to detect only 38% of the available window fatalities (Bracey et al. 2016). Loss et al. (2014) excluded all fatality records lacking a dead bird in hand, such as injured birds or feather or blood spots on windows. Loss et al.'s (2014) fatality metric was the number of fatalities per building (where in this context a building can include a house, low-rise, or high-rise structure), but they assumed that this metric was based on window collisions. Because most of the bird-window collision studies were limited to migration seasons, Loss et al. (2014) developed an admittedly assumption-laden correction factor for making annual estimates. Also, only 2 of the studies included adjustments for carcass persistence and searcher detection error, and it was unclear how and to what degree fatality rates were adjusted for these factors. Although Loss et al. (2014) attempted to account for some biases as well as for large sources of uncertainty mostly resulting from an opportunistic rather than systematic sampling data source, their estimated annual fatality rate across the USA was highly uncertain and vulnerable to multiple biases, most of which would have resulted in fatality estimates biased low.

In my review of bird-window collision monitoring, I found that the search radius around homes and buildings was very narrow, usually 2 meters. Based on my experience with bird collisions in other contexts, I would expect that a large portion of bird-window collision victims would end up farther than 2 m from the windows, especially when the windows are higher up on tall buildings. In my experience, searcher detection rates tend to be low for small birds deposited on ground with vegetation cover or woodchips or other types of organic matter. Also, vertebrate scavengers entrain on anthropogenic sources of mortality and quickly remove many of the carcasses, thereby preventing the fatality searcher from detecting these fatalities. Adjusting fatality rates for these factors – search radius bias, searcher detection error, and carcass persistence rates – would greatly increase nationwide estimates of bird-window collision fatalities.

Buildings can intercept many nocturnal migrants as well as birds flying in daylight. As mentioned above, Johnson and Hudson (1976) found 266 bird fatalities of 41 species within 73 months of monitoring of a four-story glass walkway at Washington State University (no adjustments attempted for undetected fatalities). Somerlot (2003) found 21 bird fatalities among 13 buildings on a university campus within only 61 days. Monitoring twice per week, Hager at al. (2008) found 215 bird fatalities of 48 species, or 55 birds/building/year, and at another site they found 142 bird fatalities of 37 species for 24 birds/building/year. Gelb and Delacretaz (2009) recorded 5,400 bird fatalities under buildings in New York City, based on a decade of monitoring only during migration periods, and some of the high-rises were associated with hundreds of fatalities each. Klem et al. (2009) monitored 73 building façades in New York City during 114 days of two migratory periods, tallying 549 collision victims, nearly 5 birds per day. Borden et al. (2010) surveyed a 1.8 km route 3 times per week during 12-month period and found 271 bird fatalities of 50 species. Parkins et al. (2015) found 35 bird fatalities of 16 species within only 45 days of monitoring under 4 building façades. From

24 days of survey over a 48-day span, Porter and Huang (2015) found 47 fatalities under 8 buildings on a university campus. Sabo et al. (2016) found 27 bird fatalities over 61 days of searches under 31 windows. In San Francisco, Kahle et al. (2016) found 355 collision victims within 1,762 days under a 5-story building. Ocampo-Peñuela et al. (2016) searched the perimeters of 6 buildings on a university campus, finding 86 fatalities after 63 days of surveys. One of these buildings produced 61 of the 86 fatalities, and another building with collision-deterrent glass caused only 2 of the fatalities, thereby indicating a wide range in impacts likely influenced by various factors. There is ample evidence available to support my prediction that the proposed project would result in many collision fatalities of birds.

Project Impact Prediction

By the time of these comments, I had reviewed and processed results of bird collision monitoring at 213 buildings and façades for which bird collisions per $m^2$ of glass per year could be calculated and averaged (Johnson and Hudson 1976, O'Connell 2001, Somerlot 2003, Hager et al. 2008, Borden et al. 2010, Hager et al. 2013, Porter and Huang 2015, Parkins et al. 2015, Kahle et al. 2016, Ocampo-Peñuela et al. 2016, Sabo et al. 2016, Barton et al. 2017, Gomez-Moreno et al. 2018, Schneider et al. 2018, Loss et al. 2019, Brown et al. 2020, City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Audubon 2020, Riding et al. 2020). These study results averaged 0.073 bird deaths per $m^2$ of glass per year (95% CI: 0.042-0.102). This average and its 95% confidence interval provide a robust basis for predicting fatality rates at a proposed new project.

The Addendum includes an increase of 4,000 residential units. The floorspace per residential unit of condominiums, townhouses and apartments among the projects I have reviewed as an expert have averaged 1,296.3 square feet per unit. The average square footage of the apartments that contributed to this average was consistent with the floorspace reported in the Addendum as an example 590-foot-tall apartment building in the project, which itself would average 949 sf per unit with 60,700 sf of retail space. I estimate the total square footage of 4,000 residential units would be 5,185,251 sf.

Among the 45 residential projects I have reviewed as an expert and for which I was able to measure the extent of structural glass on proposed building facades depicted in renderings provided in the environmental review documents, I measured an average 0.01872 (95% confidence interval: 0.00989–0.02754) $m^2$ per square foot of floorspace. This rate multiplied by the total square footage of 4,000 additional residential units would predict 97,060 (95% CI: 51,300–142,821) $m^2$ of additional structural glass on the facades of new buildings in the City. The mean window area multiplied against the mean collision mortality measured across North America predicts 7,095 (aggregate[1] 95% CI: 2,226–14,82) bird fatalities per year. More than seven thousand additional fatalities per

[1] What I mean by aggregate CI is that the lower bound estimate of the window area is multiplied by the lower bound estimate of collision mortality, and the upper bound estimate of the window area is multiplied by the upper bound estimate of collision mortality.

year above the level that would be expected under the 2022 plan would be a substantial number, and it should easily qualify as a highly significant impact.

Nearly all predicted deaths would be of birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and under the California Migratory Bird Protection Act, thus causing significant impacts. Given the predicted level of bird-window collision mortality, it is my opinion that the proposed project would result in potentially significant adverse biological impacts, including the unmitigated take of aerial habitats of birds, bats and other volant wildlife. Not only would the project take habitat of rare and sensitive species of birds, but it would transform the building's airspace into a lethal collision trap to birds.

## SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF PREDICTED AVIAN COLLISION MORTALITY

San Francisco is situated within the Pacific Flyway, which is one of the most intensely used bird migration pathways in the world. It is also known that birds migrate along the coast and across Hawk Hill and the Marin Headlands, many headed to or from the Altamont Pass where I spent thousands of hours observing migrants during both day and night over about 20 years. Between Hawk Hill and the Altamont Pass is San Francisco, which must be visited by many thousands of migrating birds. Knowing which species of birds and how many birds move across San Francisco, and knowing specific flight paths that are disproportionately used by season would be useful for predicting where increases in building heights would pose greater risks to birds. Unfortunately, the data on bird movement through San Francisco are sparse.

There *are* data on bird species richness. Golden Gate Audubon Society ("GGAS") (2020), tallied 47 species of birds on Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve in about 54 hours of surveys between 16 March and 29 December 2019. On the same Reserve on 20 August 2020, I detected 23 species of birds over a much shorter time, but a model I fit to my data predicts that I would have detected the same number of bird species as GGAS (2020) had I surveyed for 11 hours and 40 minutes, and that I would have detected 117 species of birds had I surveyed for 54 hours (Figure 1).

I repeated my survey on Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve on 16 July 2021, and I implemented the same survey methods such as start time, duration, and survey route. The second survey yielded even more species detections and at a faster rate (red circles in Figure 2). Between both surveys I detected 37 species of birds, but adding the results of GGAS (2021) brings the total number of bird species to 71. With additional surveys, this number would surely increase. The evidence is that many birds find and use aerohabitat in San Francisco.

Kahle et al. (2016) detected 40 species of birds at the California Academy of Sciences building in Golden Gatee Park (Table 2). More importantly, members of 34 (85%) of these species were also recorded as window collision fatalities, and members of 37 (93%) of these species appear in the scientific literature as window collision fatalities. Killed disproportionately relative to their observed abundances were special-status species such as Allen's hummingbird and yellow warbler (Figure 3). Both these species are found in abundance in San Francisco (Photo 1).

***Figure 1.*** *Cumulative number of bird species detected as a power function of the number of minutes devoted to the survey. The model explained 98% of the variation, with a root mean square error of 17.71. Had I been able to commit more time to the survey, I am confident a different model would have better fit the resulting data – a model more expressive of an asymptote.*




***Figure 2.*** *Actual and predicted relationships between the number of vertebrate wildlife species (all but 2 were birds) detected and the elapsed survey time based on my visual-scan surveys on 20 August 2020 and 16 July 2021.*

$$Y_{2020} = \frac{1}{0.001559 + 0.935847(X+1)^{-0.580731}}$$

$$Y_{2021} = \frac{1}{0.0016586 + 0.459981(X+1)^{-0.543857}}$$



***Table 2.*** *Species observed on site or reported as window-collision victims at the California Academy of Sciences (CAS) buildings (Kahle et al. 2016).*

| Species | Scientific name | Status[1] | Number counted at CAS study | | Known window deaths in North America |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | As window deaths | Alive in survey plots | |
| Western gull | *Larus occidentalis* | BCC | | 4 | |
| Red-tailed hawk | *Buteo jamaicensis* | BOP | | 1 | Yes |
| Red-shouldered hawk | *Buteo lineatus* | BOP | | 1 | Yes |
| Mourning dove | *Zenaida macroura* | | 6 | 3 | Yes |
| Great-horned owl | *Bubo virginianus* | BOP | | 1 | Yes |
| Anna's hummingbird | *Calypte anna* | | 131 | 256 | Yes |
| Allen's hummingbird | *Selasphorus sasin* | BCC | 37 | 29 | Yes |
| Costa's hummingbird | *Calypte costae* | BCC | 1 | 0 | Yes |
| Rufous hummingbird | *Selasphorus rufus* | BCC | 4 | 0 | Yes |
| Nuttall's woodpecker | *Picoides nuttallii* | BCC | | 13 | |
| Pacific-slope flycatcher | *Empidonax difficilis* | | 1 | 5 | Yes |
| Black phoebe | *Sayornis nigricans* | | 3 | 34 | Yes |
| Chestnut-backed chickadee | *Poecile rufescens* | | 1 | 203 | Yes |
| Bushtit | *Psaltriparus minimus* | | 1 | 399 | Yes |
| Brown creeper | *Certhia americana* | | 1 | 52 | Yes |
| Pygmy nuthatch | *Sitta pygmaea* | | 1 | 242 | Yes |
| Swainson's thrush | *Catharus ustulatus* | | 1 | 1 | Yes |
| Hermit thrush | *Catharus guttatus* | | 8 | 82 | Yes |
| American robin | *Turdus vulvaris* | | 3 | 389 | Yes |
| Warbling vireo | *Vireo gilvus* | | 1 | 5 | Yes |
| Yellow-rumped warbler | *Setophaga coronata* | | 7 | 92 | Yes |
| Orange-crowned warbler | *Oreothlypis celata* | | 2 | 29 | Yes |
| Townsend's warbler | *Setophaga townsendi* | | 3 | 101 | Yes |
| Wilson's warbler | *Cardellina pusilla* | | 3 | 11 | Yes |
| Yellow warbler | *Setophaga petechia* | SSC2, BCC | 7 | 18 | Yes |
| San Francisco common yellowthroat | *Geothlypis trichas sinuosa* | SSC3, BCC | 3 | 0 | Yes |
| Song sparrow | *Melospiza melodia* | | 5 | 435 | Yes |
| Golden-crowned sparrow | *Zonotrichia atricapilla* | | 3 | 230 | Yes |
| White-crowned sparrow | *Zonotrichia leucophrys* | | 1 | 249 | Yes |
| Savannah sparrow | *Passerculus sandwichensis* | | 2 | 0 | Yes |
| Lincoln's sparrow | *Melospiza lincolnii* | | 3 | 35 | Yes |
| Fox sparrow | *Passerella iliaca* | | 6 | 152 | Yes |

| Species | Scientific name | Status[1] | Number counted at CAS study | | Known window deaths in North America |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | As window deaths | Alive in survey plots | |
| Dark-eyed junco | *Junco hyemalis* | | 22 | 510 | Yes |
| California towhee | *Melozone crissalis* | | 1 | 92 | Yes |
| Brown-headed cowbird | *Molothrus ater* | | 1 | 39 | Yes |
| Red-winged blackbird | *Agelaius phoeniceus* | | 1 | 261 | Yes |
| Brewer's blackbird | *Euphagus cyanocephalus* | | 25 | 1027 | Yes |
| Tricolored blackbird | *Agelaius tricolor* | CT, BCC | | 15 | |
| House finch | *Haemorhous mexicanus* | | 5 | 213 | Yes |
| Lesser goldfinch | *Spinus psaltria* | | 1 | 44 | Yes |

[1] Listed as BCC = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bird Species of Conservation Concern, CT = California threatened, BOP = California Fish and Game Code 3503.5 (Birds of Prey), and SSC1, SSC2 and SSC3 = California Bird Species of Special Concern priorities 1, 2 and 3, respectively.

***Figure 3.*** *Window collision fatalities as a proportion of those observed in visual-scan surveys at the California Academy of Sciences building (data from Kahle et al. 2016).*



***Photo 1.*** *Allen's hummingbird in Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve, 16 July 2021. As found at the nearby California Academy of Sciences Building, this species is highly vulnerable to window collision mortality (Kahle et al. 2016).*

What is needed is a study of bird movement through San Francisco. Needed are data on species occurrences, numbers of birds, heights above ground, flight direction, specific behaviors and timing of flights across the City. These same types of data were collected in the nearby Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area to acquire an understanding of bird flight traffic for the purposed of guiding the sitings of new wind turbines as part of repowering (Smallwood 2017, Smallwood et al. 2017). The data could be acquired by performing periodic surveys from stations established systematically or randomly across the City, covering all times of day and night (using thermal imaging cameras) and lasting at least one year to characterize seasonality of bird movement. Based on such data, the City could more carefully plan the vertical and lateral outlay of new buildings to minimize the encounter frequencies of birds with buildings. This is important because the existing Bird-Safe Building Guidelines can accomplish only so much, and the efficacy of these Guidelines remains unmeasured and unknown. Therefore, what is also needed is a program to measure the efficacy of the Guidelines by designing an experiment to search for and count bird-window collision victims along with the implementation of carcass detection trials. The San Francisco guidelines should have also covered scientific monitoring of impacts as well as compensatory mitigation for impacts that could not be avoided, minimized or reduced. Until these types of bird movement data are in hand, the City can only speculate as to the magnitude of bird-window collision mortality and whether the mortality can be minimized or reduced via Bird-Safe Building Guidelines.

In the face of such a large increase in the number of residential units, as well as a major shift in the lateral and vertical layout of 54,000 residential units, another need is for an update in the Bird-Safe Building Guidelines (San Francisco Planning Department 2011). Much has been learned about causal factors and mitigation solutions (e.g., Sheppard and Phillips 2015). The American Bird Conservancy (ABC) produced an excellent set of

guidelines recommending actions to: (1) Minimize use of glass; (2) Placing glass behind some type of screening (grilles, shutters, exterior shades); (3) Using glass with inherent properties to reduce collisions, such as patterns, window films, decals or tape; and (4) Turning off lights during migration seasons (Sheppard and Phillips 2015).

New research results inform of the efficacy of marking windows. Whereas Klem (1990) found no deterrent effect from decals on windows, Johnson and Hudson (1976) reported a fatality reduction of about 69% after placing decals on windows. In an experiment of opportunity, Ocampo-Peñuela et al. (2016) found only 2 of 86 fatalities at one of 6 buildings – the only building with windows treated with a bird deterrent film. At the building with fritted glass, bird collisions were 82% lower than at other buildings with untreated windows. Kahle et al. (2016) added external window shades to some windowed façades to reduce fatalities 82% and 95%. Brown et al. (2020) reported an 84% lower collision probability among fritted glass windows and windows treated with ORNILUX R UV. City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Audubon (2020) reduced bird collision fatalities 94% by affixing marked Solyx window film to existing glass panels of Portland's Columbia Building. Many external and internal glass markers have been tested experimentally, some showing no effect and some showing strong deterrent effects (Klem 1989, 1990, 2009, 2011; Klem and Saenger 2013; Rössler et al. 2015).

Van Doren et al. (2021) found that nocturnal migrants contributed most of the collision fatalities in their study, and the largest predictors of fatalities were peak migration and lit windows. Van Doren et al. (2021) predicted that a light-out mitigation measure could reduce bird-window collision mortality by 60%.

Monitoring and the use of compensatory mitigation should be incorporated at any new building project because the measures recommended in the available guidelines remain of uncertain efficacy, and even if these measures are effective, they will not reduce collision fatalities to zero. The only way to assess mitigation efficacy and to quantify post-construction fatalities is to monitor the project for fatalities.

The Addendum (p. 49) concludes, "In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant biological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required." However, the FEIR did not identify the loss of aerohabitat of birds and bats as any sort of project impact, and neither does the Addendum. Furthermore, the FEIR did not identify as an impact my predicted mean mortality of 7,095 birds per year just from the additional 4,000 residential units, and an upper bound CI prediction of 14,082 birds per year.

Thank you for your consideration,

Shawn Smallwood, Ph.D.

## LITERATURE CITED


Barton, C. M., C. S. Riding, and S. R. Loss. 2017. Magnitude and correlates of bird collisions at glass bus shelters in an urban landscape. Plos One 12. (6): e0178667. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178667

Basilio, L. G., D. J. Moreno, and A, J. Piratelli. 2020. Main causes of bird-window collisions: a review. Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências 92(1): e20180745 DOI 10.1590/0001-3765202020180745.

Borden, W. C., O. M. Lockhart, A. W. Jones, and M. S. Lyons. 2010. Seasonal, taxonomic, and local habitat components of bird-window collisions on an urban university campus in Cleveland, OH. Ohio Journal of Science 110(3):44-52.

Bracey, A. M., M. A. Etterson, G. J. Niemi, and R. F. Green. 2016. Variation in bird-window collision mortality and scavenging rates within an urban landscape. The Wilson Journal of Ornithology 128:355-367.

Brown, B. B., L. Hunter, and S. Santos. 2020. Bird-window collisions: different fall and winter risk and protective factors. PeerJ 8:e9401 http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.9401

City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Audubon. 2020. Collisions at the Columbia Building: A synthesis of pre- and post-retrofit monitoring. Environmental Services of City of Portland, Oregon.

Davy, C. M., A. T. Ford, and K. C. Fraser. 2017. Aeroconservation for the fragmented skies. Conservation Letters 10(6): 773–780.

De Groot, K. L., A. G. Wilson, R. McKibbin, S. A. Hudson, K. M. Dohms, A. R. Norris, A. C. Huang, I. B. J. Whitehorne, K. T. Fort, C. Roy, J. Bourque, and S. Wilson. 2022. Bird protection treatments reduce bird-window collision risk at low-rise buildings within a Pacific coastal protected area. PeerJ 10(9):e13142 DOI 10.7717/peerj.13142.

Diehl, R. H., A. C. Peterson, R. T. Bolus, and D. Johnson. 2017. Extending the habitat concept to the airspace. USGS Staff -- Published Research. 1129. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usgsstaffpub/1129

Dunn, E. H. 1993. Bird mortality from striking residential windows in winter. Journal of Field Ornithology 64:302-309.

Gelb, Y. and N. Delacretaz. 2009. Windows and vegetation: Primary factors in Manhattan bird collisions. Northeastern Naturalist 16:455-470.

GGAS (Golden Gate Audubon Society). 2020. UCSF Mount Sutro Open Space Preserve bird monitoring survey preliminary report from survey data collected March-December 2019. Report to University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

GGAS (Golden Gate Audubon Society). 2021. UCSF Mount Sutro Open Space Preserve Bird and Lepidoptera monitoring survey report from survey data collected January-December 2020 and March-December 2019. Report to University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

Gómez-Moreno, V. del C., J. R. Herrera-Herrera, and S. Niño-Maldonado. 2018. Bird collisions in windows of Centro Universitario Victoria, Tamaulipas, México. Huitzil, Revista Mexicana de Ornitología 19(2): 227-236. https://doi.org/10.28947/hrmo.2018.19.2.347

Hager, S. B., H. Trudell, K. J. McKay, S. M. Crandall, and L. Mayer. 2008. Bird density and mortality at windows. Wilson Journal of Ornithology 120:550-564.

Hager S. B., B. J. Cosentino, K J. McKay, C. Monson, W. Zuurdeeg, and B. Blevins. 2013. Window area and development drive spatial variation in bird-window collisions in an urban landscape. PLoS ONE 8(1): e53371. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0053371

Johnson, R. E., and G. E. Hudson. 1976. Bird mortality at a glassed-in walkway in Washington State. Western Birds 7:99-107.

Kahle, L. Q., M. E. Flannery, and J. P. Dumbacher. 2016. Bird-window collisions at a west-coast urban park museum: analyses of bird biology and window attributes from Golden Gate Park, San Francisco. PLoS ONE 11(1):e144600 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0144600.

Klem, D., Jr. 1989. Bird-window collisions. Wilson Bulletin 101:606-620.

Klem, D., Jr. 1990. Collisions between birds and windows: mortality and prevention. Journal of Field Ornithology 61:120-128.

Klem, D., Jr. 2009. Preventing bird-window collisions. The Wilson Journal of Ornithology 121:314-321.

Klem, D., Jr. 2011. Evaluating the effectiveness of Acopian Birdsavers to deter or prevent bird-glass collisions. Unpublished report.

Klem, D., Jr. and P. G. Saenger. 2013. Evaluating the effectiveness of select visual signals to prevent bird-window collisions. The Wilson Journal of Ornithology 125:406–411.

Kunz, T. H., S. A. Gauthreaux Jr., N. I. Hristov, J. W. Horn, G. Jones, E. K. V. Kalko, R. P. Larkin, G. F. McCracken, S. M. Swartz, R. B. Srygley, R. Dudley, J. K. Westbrook, and M. Wikelski. 2008. Aeroecology: probing and modelling the aerosphere. Integrative and Comparative Biology 48:1-11. doi:10.1093/icb/icn037

Loss, S. R., T. Will, S. S. Loss, and P. P. Marra. 2014. Bird–building collisions in the United States: Estimates of annual mortality and species vulnerability. The Condor: Ornithological Applications 116:8-23. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-13-090.1

Loss, S. R., S. Lao, J. W. Eckles, A. W. Anderson, R. B. Blair, and R. J. Turner. 2019. Factors influencing bird-building collisions in the downtown area of a major North American city. PLoS ONE 14(11): e0224164. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224164

Machtans, C. S., C. H. R. Wedeles, and E. M. Bayne. 2013. A first estimate for Canada of the number of birds killed by colliding with building windows. Avian Conservation and Ecology 8(2):6. http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ACE-00568-080206

Ocampo-Peñuela, N., R. S. Winton, C. J. Wu, E. Zambello, T. W. Wittig and N. L. Cagle . 2016. Patterns of bird-window collisions inform mitigation on a university campus. PeerJ4:e1652;DOI10.7717/peerj.1652

O'Connell, T. J. 2001. Avian window strike mortality at a suburban office park. The Raven 72:141-149.

Parkins, K. L., S. B. Elbin, and E. Barnes. 2015. Light, glass, and bird–building collisions in an urban park. Northeastern Naturalist 22:84-94.

Porter, A., and A. Huang. 2015. Bird collisions with glass: UBC pilot project to assess bird collision rates in Western North America. UBC Social Ecological Economic Development Studies (SEEDS) Student Report. Report to Environment Canada, UBC SEEDS and UBC BRITE.

Riding, C. S., T. J. O'Connell, and S. R. Loss. 2020. Building façade-level correlates of bird–window collisions in a small urban area. The Condor: Ornithological Applications 122:1–14.

Riggs, G. J., C. M. Barton, C. S. Riding, T. J. O'Connell1, and S. R. Loss. 2023. Field-testing effectiveness of window markers in reducing bird-window collisions. Urban Ecosystems (2023) 26:713–723. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-022-01304-w

Rosenberg, K. V., A. M. Dokter, P. J. Blancher, J. R. Sauer, A. C. Smith, P. A. Smith, J. C. Stanton, A. Panjabi , L. Helft , M. Parr, and P. P. Marra. 2019. Decline of the North American avifauna. Science 10.1126/science.aaw1313 (2019).

Rössler, M., E. Nemeth, and A. Bruckner. 2015. Glass pane markings to prevent bird-window collisions: less can be more. Biologia 70: 535—541. DOI: 10.1515/biolog-2015-0057

Sabo, A. M., N. D. G. Hagemeyer, A. S. Lahey, and E. L. Walters. 2016. Local avian density influences risk of mortality from window strikes. PeerJ 4:e2170; DOI 10.7717/peerj.2170

San Francisco Planning Department. 2011. Standards for bird-safe buildings. San Francisco Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco, California.

Schneider, R. M., C. M. Barton, K. W. Zirkle, C. F. Greene, and K. B. Newman. 2018. Year-round monitoring reveals prevalence of fatal bird-window collisions at the Virginia Tech Corporate Research Center. *PeerJ* 6:e4562 https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4562

Sheppard, C., and G. Phillips. 2015. Bird-friendly building design, 2nd Ed., American Bird Conservancy, The Plains, Virginia.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. Monitoring birds. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Smallwood, K. S., and N. L. Smallwood. 2023. Measured effects of anthropogenic development on vertebrate wildlife diversity. Diversity 15, 1037. https://doi.org/10.3390/d15101037.

Smallwood, K. S., L. Neher, and D. A. Bell. 2017. Siting to Minimize Raptor Collisions: an example from the Repowering Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Somerlot, K. E. 2003. Survey of songbird mortality due to window collisions on the Murray State University campus. Journal of Service Learning in Conservation Biology 1:1–19.

Swaddle, J. P., B. Brewster, M. Schuyler, and A. Su. 2023. Window films increase avoidance of collisions by birds but only when applied to external compared with internal surfaces of windows. PeerJ 11:e14676 http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.14676

Van Doren, B. M., D. E. Willardb, M. Hennenb, K. G. Hortonc, E. F. Stubera, D. Sheldond, A. H. Sivakumare, J. Wanga, A. Farnswortha, and B. M. Winger. 2021. Drivers of fatal bird collisions in an urban center. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118 (24). e2101666118

# Kenneth Shawn Smallwood
# Curriculum Vitae

3108 Finch Street
Davis, CA 95616
Phone (530) 756-4598
Cell (530) 601-6857
puma@dcn.org

Born May 3, 1963 in Sacramento, California.
Married, father of two.

## Ecologist

### Expertise

- Finding solutions to controversial problems related to wildlife interactions with human industry, infrastructure, and activities;
- Wildlife monitoring and field study using GPS, thermal imaging, behavior surveys;
- Using systems analysis and experimental design principles to identify meaningful ecological patterns that inform management decisions.

### Education

Ph.D. Ecology, University of California, Davis. September 1990.
M.S. Ecology, University of California, Davis. June 1987.
B.S. Anthropology, University of California, Davis. June 1985.
Corcoran High School, Corcoran, California. June 1981.

### Experience

- 762 professional reports, including:
- 90 peer reviewed publications
- 24 in non-reviewed proceedings
- 646 reports, declarations, posters and book reviews
- 8 in mass media outlets
- 92 public presentations of research results

Editing for scientific journals: Guest Editor, *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 2012-2013, of invited papers representing international views on the impacts of wind energy on wildlife and how to mitigate the impacts. Associate Editor, *Journal of Wildlife Management*, March 2004 to 30 June 2007. Editorial Board Member, *Environmental Management*, 10/1999 to 8/2004. Associate Editor, *Biological Conservation*, 9/1994 to 9/1995.

Member, Alameda County Scientific Review Committee (SRC), August 2006 to April 2011. The five-member committee investigated causes of bird and bat collisions in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, and recommended mitigation and monitoring measures. The SRC reviewed the science underlying the Alameda County Avian Protection Program, and advised

the County on how to reduce wildlife fatalities.

Consulting Ecologist, 2004-2007, California Energy Commission (CEC). Provided consulting services as needed to the CEC on renewable energy impacts, monitoring and research, and produced several reports. Also collaborated with Lawrence-Livermore National Lab on research to understand and reduce wind turbine impacts on wildlife.

Consulting Ecologist, 1999-2013, U.S. Navy. Performed endangered species surveys, hazardous waste site monitoring, and habitat restoration for the endangered San Joaquin kangaroo rat, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, California clapper rail, western burrowing owl, salt marsh harvest mouse, and other species at Naval Air Station Lemoore; Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord; Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island; National Radio Transmitter Facility, Dixon; and, Naval Outlying Landing Field Imperial Beach.

Part-time Lecturer, 1998-2005, California State University, Sacramento. Instructed Mammalogy, Behavioral Ecology, and Ornithology Lab, Contemporary Environmental Issues, Natural Resources Conservation.

Senior Ecologist, 1999-2005, BioResource Consultants. Designed and implemented research and monitoring studies related to avian fatalities at wind turbines, avian electrocutions on electric distribution poles across California, and avian fatalities at transmission lines.

Chairman, Conservation Affairs Committee, The Wildlife Society--Western Section, 1999-2001. Prepared position statements and led efforts directed toward conservation issues, including travel to Washington, D.C. to lobby Congress for more wildlife conservation funding.

Systems Ecologist, 1995-2000, Institute for Sustainable Development. Headed ISD's program on integrated resources management. Developed indicators of ecological integrity for large areas, using remotely sensed data, local community involvement and GIS.

Associate, 1997-1998, Department of Agronomy and Range Science, University of California, Davis. Worked with Shu Geng and Mingua Zhang on several studies related to wildlife interactions with agriculture and patterns of fertilizer and pesticide residues in groundwater across a large landscape.

Lead Scientist, 1996-1999, National Endangered Species Network. Informed academic scientists and environmental activists about emerging issues regarding the Endangered Species Act and other environmental laws. Testified at public hearings on endangered species issues.

Ecologist, 1997-1998, Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology. Conducted field research to determine the impact of past mercury mining on the status of California red-legged frogs in Santa Clara County, California.

Senior Systems Ecologist, 1994-1995, EIP Associates, Sacramento, California. Provided consulting services in environmental planning, and quantitative assessment of land units for their conservation and restoration opportunities basedon ecological resource requirements of 29 special-status species. Developed ecological indicators for prioritizing areas within Yolo County

to receive mitigation funds for habitat easements and restoration.

Post-Graduate Researcher, 1990-1994, Department of Agronomy and Range Science, *U.C. Davis*. Under Dr. Shu Geng's mentorship, studied landscape and management effects on temporal and spatial patterns of abundance among pocket gophers and species of Falconiformes and Carnivora in the Sacramento Valley. Managed and analyzed a data base of energy use in California agriculture. Assisted with landscape (GIS) study of groundwater contamination across Tulare County, California.

Work experience in graduate school: Co-taught Conservation Biology with Dr. Christine Schonewald, 1991 & 1993, UC Davis Graduate Group in Ecology; Reader for Dr. Richard Coss's course on Psychobiology in 1990, UC Davis Department of Psychology; Research Assistant to Dr. Walter E. Howard, 1988-1990, UC Davis Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, testing durable baits for pocket gopher management in forest clearcuts; Research Assistant to Dr. Terrell P. Salmon, 1987-1988, UC Wildlife Extension, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, developing empirical models of mammal and bird invasions in North America, and a rating system for priority research and control of exotic species based on economic, environmental and human health hazards in California. Student Assistant to Dr. E. Lee Fitzhugh, 1985-1987, UC Cooperative Extension, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, developing and implementing statewide mountain lion track count for long-term monitoring.

Fulbright Research Fellow, Indonesia, 1988. Tested use of new sampling methods for numerical monitoring of Sumatran tiger and six other species of endemic felids, and evaluated methods used by other researchers.

**Projects**

Repowering wind energy projects through careful siting of new wind turbines using map-based collision hazard models to minimize impacts to volant wildlife. Funded by wind companies (principally NextEra Renewable Energy, Inc.), California Energy Commission and East Bay Regional Park District, I have collaborated with a GIS analyst and managed a crew of five field biologists performing golden eagle behavior surveys and nocturnal surveys on bats and owls. The goal is to quantify flight patterns for development of predictive models to more carefully site new wind turbines in repowering projects. Focused behavior surveys began May 2012 and continue. Collision hazard models have been prepared for seven wind projects, three of which were built. Planning for additional repowering projects is underway.

Test avian safety of new mixer-ejector wind turbine (MEWT). Designed and implemented a before-after, control-impact experimental design to test the avian safety of a new, shrouded wind turbine developed by Ogin Inc. (formerly known as FloDesign Wind Turbine Corporation). Supported by a $718,000 grant from the California Energy Commission's Public Interest Energy Research program and a 20% match share contribution from Ogin, I managed a crew of seven field biologists who performed periodic fatality searches and behavior surveys, carcass detection trials, nocturnal behavior surveys using a thermal camera, and spatial analyses with the collaboration of a GIS analyst. Field work began 1 April 2012 and ended 30 March 2015 without Ogin installing its MEWTs, but we still achieved multiple important scientific advances.

Reduce avian mortality due to wind turbines at Altamont Pass. Studied wildlife impacts caused by 5,400 wind turbines at the world's most notorious wind resource area. Studied how impacts are perceived by monitoring and how they are affected by terrain, wind patterns, food resources, range management practices, wind turbine operations, seasonal patterns, population cycles, infrastructure management such as electric distribution, animal behavior and social interactions.

Reduce avian mortality on electric distribution poles. Directed research toward reducing bird electrocutions on electric distribution poles, 2000-2007. Oversaw 5 founds of fatality searches at 10,000 poles from Orange County to Glenn County, California, and produced two large reports.

Cook *et al*. v. Rockwell International *et al*., No. 90-K-181 (D. Colorado). Provided expert testimony on the role of burrowing animals in affecting the fate of buried and surface-deposited radioactive and hazardous chemical wastes at the Rocky Flats Plant, Colorado. Provided expert reports based on four site visits and an extensive document review of burrowing animals. Conducted transect surveys for evidence of burrowing animals and other wildlife on and around waste facilities. Discovered substantial intrusion of waste structures by burrowing animals. I testified in federal court in November 2005, and my clients were subsequently awarded a $553,000,000 judgment by a jury. After appeals the award was increased to two billion dollars.

Hanford Nuclear Reservation Litigation. Provided expert testimony on the role of burrowing animals in affecting the fate of buried radioactive wastes at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, Washington. Provided three expert reports based on three site visits and extensive document review. Predicted and verified a certain population density of pocket gophers on buried waste structures, as well as incidence of radionuclide contamination in body tissue. Conducted transect surveys for evidence of burrowing animals and other wildlife on and around waste facilities. Discovered substantial intrusion of waste structures by burrowing animals.

Expert testimony and declarations on proposed residential and commercial developments, gas-fired power plants, wind, solar and geothermal projects, water transfers and water transfer delivery systems, endangered species recovery plans, Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Communities Conservation Programs. Testified before multiple government agencies, Tribunals, Boards of Supervisors and City Councils, and participated with press conferences and depositions. Prepared expert witness reports and court declarations, which are summarized under Reports (below).

Protocol-level surveys for special-status species. Used California Department of Fish and Wildlife and US Fish and Wildlife Service protocols to search for California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, arroyo southwestern toad, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, western pond turtle, giant kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kit fox, western burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle and other special-status species.

Conservation of San Joaquin kangaroo rat. Performed research to identify factors responsible for the decline of this endangered species at Lemoore Naval Air Station, 2000-2013, and implemented habitat enhancements designed to reverse the trend and expand the population.

Impact of West Nile Virus on yellow-billed magpies. Funded by Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District, 2005-2008, compared survey results pre- and post-West Nile Virus epidemic for multiple bird species in the Sacramento Valley, particularly on yellow-billed magpie and American crow due to susceptibility to WNV.

Workshops on HCPs. Assisted Dr. Michael Morrison with organizing and conducting a 2-day workshop on Habitat Conservation Plans, sponsored by Southern California Edison, and another 1-day workshop sponsored by PG&E. These Workshops were attended by academics, attorneys, and consultants with HCP experience. We guest-edited a Proceedings published in Environmental Management.

Mapping of biological resources along Highways 101, 46 and 41. Used GPS and GIS to delineate vegetation complexes and locations of special-status species along 26 miles of highway in San Luis Obispo County, 14 miles of highway and roadway in Monterey County, and in a large area north of Fresno, including within reclaimed gravel mining pits.

GPS mapping and monitoring at restoration sites and at Caltrans mitigation sites. Monitored the success of elderberry shrubs at one location, the success of willows at another location, and the response of wildlife to the succession of vegetation at both sites. Also used GPS to monitor the response of fossorial animals to yellow star-thistle eradication and natural grassland restoration efforts at Bear Valley in Colusa County and at the decommissioned Mather Air Force Base in Sacramento County.

Mercury effects on Red-legged Frog. Assisted Dr. Michael Morrison and US Fish and Wildlife Service in assessing the possible impacts of historical mercury mining on the federally listed California red-legged frog in Santa Clara County. Also measured habitat variables in streams.

Opposition to proposed No Surprises rule. Wrote a white paper and summary letter explaining scientific grounds for opposing the incidental take permit (ITP) rules providing ITP applicants and holders with general assurances they will be free of compliance with the Endangered Species Act once they adhere to the terms of a "properly functioning HCP." Submitted 188 signatures of scientists and environmental professionals concerned about No Surprises rule US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, all US Senators.

Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan alternative. Designed narrow channel marsh to increase the likelihood of survival and recovery in the wild of giant garter snake, Swainson's hawk and Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The design included replication and interspersion of treatments for experimental testing of critical habitat elements. I provided a report to Northern Territories, Inc.

Assessments of agricultural production system and environmental technology transfer to China. Twice visited China and interviewed scientists, industrialists, agriculturalists, and the Directors of the Chinese Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture to assess the need and possible pathways for environmental clean-up technologies and trade opportunities between the US and China.

Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan. Conducted landscape ecology study of Yolo County to spatially prioritize allocation of mitigation efforts to improve ecosystem functionality within the County from the perspective of 29 special-status species of wildlife and plants. Used a hierarchically structured indicators approach to apply principles of landscape and ecosystem ecology, conservation biology, and local values in rating land units. Derived GIS maps to help guide the conservation area design, and then developed implementation strategies.

Mountain lion track count. Developed and conducted a carnivore monitoring program throughout California since 1985. Species counted include mountain lion, bobcat, black bear, coyote, red and gray fox, raccoon, striped skunk, badger, and black-tailed deer. Vegetation and land use are also monitored. Track survey transect was established on dusty, dirt roads within randomly selected quadrats.

Sumatran tiger and other felids. Upon award of Fulbright Research Fellowship, I designed and initiated track counts for seven species of wild cats in Sumatra, including Sumatran tiger, fishing cat, and golden cat. Spent four months on Sumatra and Java in 1988, and learned Bahasa Indonesia, the official Indonesian language.

Wildlife in agriculture. Beginning as post-graduate research, I studied pocket gophers and other wildlife in 40 alfalfa fields throughout the Sacramento Valley, and I surveyed for wildlife along a 200 mile road transect since 1989 with a hiatus of 1996-2004. The data are analyzed using GIS and methods from landscape ecology, and the results published and presented orally to farming groups in California and elsewhere. I also conducted the first study of wildlife in cover crops used on vineyards and orchards.

Agricultural energy use and Tulare County groundwater study. Developed and analyzed a data base of energy use in California agriculture, and collaborated on a landscape (GIS) study of groundwater contamination across Tulare County, California.

Pocket gopher damage in forest clear-cuts. Developed gopher sampling methods and tested various poison baits and baiting regimes in the largest-ever field study of pocket gopher management in forest plantations, involving 68 research plots in 55 clear-cuts among 6 National Forests in northern California.

Risk assessment of exotic species in North America. Developed empirical models of mammal and bird species invasions in North America, as well as a rating system for assigning priority research and control to exotic species in California, based on economic, environmental, and human health hazards.

**Peer Reviewed Publications**

Smallwood, K. S. 2022. Utility-scale solar impacts to volant wildlife. Journal of Wildlife Management: e22216. https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.22216

Smallwood, K. S., and N. L. Smallwood. 2021. Breeding Density and Collision Mortality of Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. Diversity 13, 540. https://doi.org/10.3390/d13110540.

Smallwood, K. S. 2020. USA wind energy-caused bat fatalities increase with shorter fatality search intervals. Diversity 12(98); https://doi.org/10.3390/d12030098

Smallwood, K. S., D. A. Bell, and S. Standish. 2020. Dogs detect larger wind energy impacts on bats and birds. Journal of Wildlife Management 84:852-864. DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.21863.

Smallwood, K. S., and D. A. Bell. 2020. Relating bat passage rates to wind turbine fatalities.

Diversity 12(84); doi:10.3390/d12020084.

Smallwood, K. S., and D. A. Bell. 2020. Effects of wind turbine curtailment on bird and bat fatalities. Journal of Wildlife Management 84:684-696. DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.21844

Kitano, M., M. Ino, K. S. Smallwood, and S. Shiraki. 2020. Seasonal difference in carcass persistence rates at wind farms with snow, Hokkaido, Japan. Ornithological Science 19: 63 – 71.

Smallwood, K. S. and M. L. Morrison. 2018. Nest-site selection in a high-density colony of burrowing owls. Journal of Raptor Research 52:454-470.

Smallwood, K. S., D. A. Bell, E. L. Walther, E. Leyvas, S. Standish, J. Mount, B. Karas. 2018. Estimating wind turbine fatalities using integrated detection trials. Journal of Wildlife Management 82:1169-1184.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. Long search intervals under-estimate bird and bat fatalities caused by wind turbines. Wildlife Society Bulletin 41:224-230.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. The challenges of addressing wildlife impacts when repowering wind energy projects. Pages 175-187 in Köppel, J., Editor, Wind Energy and Wildlife Impacts: Proceedings from the CWW2015 Conference. Springer. Cham, Switzerland.

May, R., Gill, A. B., Köppel, J. Langston, R. H.W., Reichenbach, M., Scheidat, M., Smallwood, S., Voigt, C. C., Hüppop, O., and Portman, M. 2017. Future research directions to reconcile wind turbine–wildlife interactions. Pages 255-276 in Köppel, J., Editor, Wind Energy and Wildlife Impacts: Proceedings from the CWW2015 Conference. Springer. Cham, Switzerland.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. Monitoring birds. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Smallwood, K. S., L. Neher, and D. A. Bell. 2017. Turbine siting for raptors: an example from Repowering of the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Johnson, D. H., S. R. Loss, K. S. Smallwood, W. P. Erickson. 2016. Avian fatalities at wind energy facilities in North America: A comparison of recent approaches. Human–Wildlife Interactions 10(1):7-18.

Sadar, M. J., D. S.-M. Guzman, A. Mete, J. Foley, N. Stephenson, K. H. Rogers, C. Grosset, K. S. Smallwood, J. Shipman, A. Wells, S. D. White, D. A. Bell, and M. G. Hawkins. 2015. Mange Caused by a novel Micnemidocoptes mite in a Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*). Journal of Avian Medicine and Surgery 29(3):231-237.

Smallwood, K. S. 2015. Habitat fragmentation and corridors. Pages 84-101 in M. L. Morrison and H. A. Mathewson, Eds., Wildlife habitat conservation: concepts, challenges, and solutions. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.

# EXHIBIT D

FASTCAST

Deborah Holley

Cc/ Richard Drurey

December 1, 2025

# PRELIMINARY SHADOW ANALYSIS: **PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING 2025**, JOE DIMAGGIO PLAYGROUND, SAN FRANCISCO

Fastcast is hereby submitting the results of a **programmatic shadow analysis** prepared for the proposed **Family Zoning Plan**. This analysis is intended to quantify the **generalized potential change in shadow on Joe DiMaggio Playground** under a scenario in which the proposed height increases on surrounding parcels are fully utilized.

As part of the methodology, **City building footprint data** was used to define both the **existing zoning height extrusions** and the **Family Zoning Plan height extrusions** using the **same building footprints**. In this area, the **existing zoning envelope (generally 40 feet in height)** is treated as an **existing shadow-casting condition**, and the Family Zoning scenario adds only the **incremental height above this existing zoning envelope**. The **proposed shadows are therefore based solely on the height increase introduced by the Family Zoning Plan**, and **net new shadow** on Joe DiMaggio Playground is calculated only for this **incremental zoning height increase**.

The analysis applies **methodologies and data models consistent with San Francisco Planning Department and Planning Code Section 295 ("Shadow Ordinance") standards and procedures**, as outlined in the July 2014 memorandum *"Shadow Analysis Procedures and Scope Requirements"* and as refined by subsequent written directives issued by the San Francisco Planning Department.

# I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum documents **preliminary quantitative shadow results** for **Joe DiMaggio Playground** associated with proposed height increases under the **San Francisco Family Zoning Plan (FZP)** in the North Beach area.

The purpose is to:

1. Summarize the **Family Zoning Plan objectives**,
2. Describe the **objective of the shadow analysis** for Joe DiMaggio Playground, and
3. Present a **neutral, scientific summary** of the **net new shadow** on the playground and the **times of day/season** when this potential shadow increase overlaps with typical playground activities.

No conclusions are offered regarding policy, compliance, or adequacy; this memo is limited to **description and quantification**.

# II. FAMILY ZONING PLAN – CONTEXT & OBJECTIVES

According to the **Family Zoning Plan "Five Fast Facts"** document:

- The Plan is intended to create capacity for **over 36,000 homes** on San Francisco's north and west sides.
- In most areas, existing building heights remain **40 feet (approximately four stories)**.
- The Plan allows **two to four additional stories** in select locations, mainly **near shopping, transit, and on major streets**, with high-rise buildings permitted only in limited areas.
- The Plan uses a **form-based approach**, regulating height, bulk, and setbacks, and is paired with **objective design standards**.
- The stated goals include meeting state housing requirements, maintaining local control over land use decisions, and strengthening tenant protections by directing growth toward underused and vacant sites.

Within this framework, the North Beach area surrounding **Joe DiMaggio Playground** is identified for **increased maximum building heights**, which in turn has the potential to increase shadow on the playground.

# III. OBJECTIVE OF THE SHADOW ANALYSIS

The objective of the shadow analysis is to **quantify net new shadow** that could occur on **Joe DiMaggio Playground** as a result of the **proposed Family Zoning height increases**, using standard methods applied in San Francisco shadow studies.

Specifically, the analysis aims to:

1. Measure **annual shadow load** on Joe DiMaggio Playground under:
    - Existing conditions, and
    - A scenario with Family Zoning Plan height increases.
2. Determine:
    - **Net new annual shadow** (in square foot hours, sfh),
    - **Percent of available sunlight time** affected,
    - **Maximum area of net new shadow** and **percentage of the playground covered**, and
    - **Dates, times of day, and seasons** when net new shadow occurs.

These results are summarized in the City's **"PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING HEIGHT INCREASE – JOE DIMAGGIO ANNUAL SHADOW LOADS / SQUARE FOOT HOURS (sfh)"** sheet, which is the primary quantitative source referenced here.

FASTCAST

# IV. QUANTITATIVE SHADOW RESULTS – JOE DIMAGGIO PLAYGROUND

All values below are taken directly from the **Joe DiMaggio Playground shadow summary** unless otherwise noted. Note: Existing shadow is based on Data SF Building Footprints : https://data.sfgov.org/Geographic-Locations-and-Boundaries/Building-Footprints/ynuv-fyni/about_data and Zoning heights derived from Proposed zoning interactive map: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6e0e399f9c82456dbda233eacebc433d/

| PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING HEIGHT INCREASE<br>JOE DIMAGGIO ANNUAL SHADOW LOADS / SQUARE FOOT HOURS (sfh) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Existing / Current Shadow | Project Net New Shadow | Existing + Project Shadow | Remaining Sunlight |
| **9.63%** | **1.485%** | **11.115%** | **88.89%** |
| 31,210,748 sfh | 4,814,888 sfh | 36,025,636 sfh | 288,182,732 sfh |

| | |
|---|---|
| Joe DiMaggio Annual Shadow Load with Project (sfh) | 36,025,636 sfh |

| EXISTING SHADOW DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| Range in existing shadow area coverage throughout the year | Between 2% - 72% |
| Time of year / time of day most affected by existing shadow | Fall / Early Morning (before 8:00 AM) |

| NET NEW SHADOW DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| Days net new shadow would occur (date range) | Year-round |
| Date(s) with most sfh net new shadow | October 11 & March 1 |
| Season / Time of day most affected by net new shadow | Winter / Late Afternoon (after 4:30 PM) |
| Area of largest net new shadow (date and time) | 23,682 sf (October 11 & March 1 @ 5:37 PM ) |
| Percentage of Joe DiMaggio covered by largest shadow | 27.18% |
| Range in shadow coverage throughout the year (area range) | Between 0% - 27% (0 - 23,682 sf ) |
| Average shadow size across affected dates (percent coverage) | 4,488 sf (5.15%) |
| Date(s) with the longest duration of net new shadow (duration) | October 11 & March 1 (4 hr 6 min +/- 14 min) |
| Range in daily net new shadow duration across affected dates | Between zero minutes up to 4 hr 6 min (+/- 14 min) |
| Average daily net new shadow duration across affected dates | 3 hr 22 min |

## Timing and Seasonal Pattern of Net New Shadow

Also from the shadow summary:

- **Days net new shadow would occur:**
  - **Year-round**
- **Date(s) with most sfh net new shadow:**
  - **October 11 & March 1**
  - **Season / Time of day most affected by net new shadow: Winter / Late Afternoon (after 4:30 PM)**

## Existing Shadow Context

For reference, the summary characterizes **existing shadow** as:

- **Range in existing shadow area coverage throughout the year: 2% – 72%** of the playground area
- **Time of year / time of day most affected by existing shadow: Fall / Early Morning (before 8:00 AM)**




# V. QUALITATIVE CONTEXT: PLAYGROUND ACTIVITIES & TIME OF USE

This section does **not** evaluate impact or significance. It is limited to describing **typical types of activities** that commonly occur in neighborhood playgrounds like Joe DiMaggio during the times identified in the shadow summary.

## A. Typical Playground Use Patterns

Based on the nature of Joe DiMaggio Playground as a neighborhood-serving facility (with play equipment, courts/fields, and open space), typical use patterns can reasonably be described as including:

- **Morning hours:**
  - Caregivers with young children,
  - Individual exercise and walking.
- **Midday / Early afternoon:**
  - Younger children and caregivers,
  - Some daytime recreation by residents and visitors.
- **Afternoon / Late afternoon (after school):**
  - **School-aged children and teens** using play areas and courts,
  - Potential **organized or informal sports activities**,
  - Families visiting after school pick-up.
- **Early evening (seasonally):**
  - Adults and families using the space after work,
  - Light recreation, socializing, and play until dusk.

These patterns are typical of urban playgrounds serving nearby residential neighborhoods with families.

## B. Alignment with Net New Shadow Timing

The **shadow summary** identifies the **season and time of day most affected by net new shadow** as **"Winter / Late Afternoon (after 4:30 PM)"**, with net new shadow occurring **year-round** and the **longest durations and largest footprints** occurring around **October 11 and March 1 in the late afternoon (e.g., 5:37 PM for the largest single footprint).**
That time window generally overlaps with:

- **After-school hours** for school-aged children and teens, and
- **After-work hours** when adults and families may visit the playground.

The **existing shadow** is described as being most pronounced in **"Fall / Early Morning (before 8:00 AM)"**, which is a different part of the day than the late-afternoon period identified for net new shadow. This indicates that, under the Family Zoning scenario, the **distribution of shadow over the day** changes, with **additional shadow present during late-afternoon hours** when playground use often involves family and youth activities.
Again, this section is descriptive only and does not characterize these changes as beneficial or adverse.

# VI. SUMMARY

- The Family Zoning Plan allows **increased building heights** in select areas, including near Joe DiMaggio Playground, in order to support housing production goals and apply form-based, objective design standards.
- The City's **Joe DiMaggio shadow summary** quantifies **net new annual shadow load, coverage, and timing** for the playground under the Family Zoning height scenario, showing:
    - Net new shadow of **4,814,888 sfh (1.485% of available sunlight time)**,
    - A combined total shadow load of **36,025,636 sfh (11.115%)**,
    - Maximum net new momentary coverage of **23,682 square feet (27.18% of the playground)** on specific dates and times, and
    - Concentration of net new shadow in **winter late afternoons (after 4:30 PM)**, with **year-round occurrence**.
- Typical playground use during late afternoons includes **after-school and after-work** activities by children, teens, and families, which may coincide in time with the **period identified as most affected by net new shadow**.

This concludes the **descriptive, non-evaluative summary** of the Family Zoning Plan context and the associated shadow analysis results for Joe DiMaggio Playground.

## Conclusion

Fastcast has determined, based on the 3D digital zoning-based massing model and related design information provided by DataSF and the proposed Family Zoning Plan that the height increase would introduce net new shadow on Joe DiMaggio Playground relative to existing zoning conditions. The results presented herein reflect a programmatic, zoning-based analysis; as individual development proposals are advanced and more detailed building designs become available, additional project-specific shadow studies can be prepared using the same methodologies to further refine these findings.

Please direct any question to Adam Noble. adam@fastcastcity.com



# EXHIBIT A

PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

FASTCAST

# JUNE 21

Summer solstice
Analysis hours: 6:46 AM-7:36 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:46 AM | 54,298 sf | 62.33% | 2,884 sf | 3.31% |
| 7:00 AM | 37,059 sf | 42.54% | 4,008 sf | 4.60% |
| 7:15 AM | 27,564 sf | 31.64% | 3,779 sf | 4.34% |
| 7:30 AM | 21,585 sf | 24.78% | 3,408 sf | 3.91% |
| 7:45 AM | 16,695 sf | 19.16% | 3,117 sf | 3.58% |
| 8:00 AM | 12,478 sf | 14.32% | 2,829 sf | 3.25% |
| 8:15 AM | 8,935 sf | 10.26% | 2,548 sf | 2.92% |
| 8:30 AM | 5,965 sf | 6.85% | 2,316 sf | 2.66% |
| 8:45 AM | 4,408 sf | 5.06% | 1,881 sf | 2.16% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,173 sf | 4.79% | 730 sf | 0.84% |
| 9:15 AM | 3,995 sf | 4.59% | 6 sf | 0.01% |
| 9:30 AM | 3,816 sf | 4.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,655 sf | 4.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,476 sf | 3.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,299 sf | 3.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,114 sf | 3.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 2,951 sf | 3.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,772 sf | 3.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,615 sf | 3.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,434 sf | 2.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,277 sf | 2.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,094 sf | 2.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 1,940 sf | 2.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,737 sf | 1.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,578 sf | 1.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,344 sf | 1.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,442 sf | 1.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,521 sf | 1.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,658 sf | 1.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,721 sf | 1.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,841 sf | 2.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 1,898 sf | 2.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 1,995 sf | 2.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,049 sf | 2.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,132 sf | 2.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,186 sf | 2.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,248 sf | 2.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,241 sf | 2.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,472 sf | 2.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,013 sf | 3.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,530 sf | 4.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,110 sf | 4.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,753 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,486 sf | 6.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,314 sf | 7.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,287 sf | 8.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,437 sf | 9.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,878 sf | 11.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,730 sf | 13.46% | 295 sf | 0.34% |
| 7:00 PM | 14,222 sf | 16.33% | 1,770 sf | 2.03% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,809 sf | 20.44% | 5,586 sf | 6.41% |
| 7:36 PM | 29,084 sf | 33.38% | 10,652 sf | 12.23% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JUNE 28

Mirror date: June 14
Analysis hours: 6:48 AM-7:36 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:48 AM | 54,172 sf | 62.18% | 2,814 sf | 3.23% |
| 7:00 AM | 38,856 sf | 44.60% | 4,046 sf | 4.64% |
| 7:15 AM | 28,513 sf | 32.73% | 3,845 sf | 4.41% |
| 7:30 AM | 22,279 sf | 25.57% | 3,463 sf | 3.97% |
| 7:45 AM | 17,311 sf | 19.87% | 3,154 sf | 3.62% |
| 8:00 AM | 12,968 sf | 14.88% | 2,875 sf | 3.30% |
| 8:15 AM | 9,336 sf | 10.72% | 2,593 sf | 2.98% |
| 8:30 AM | 6,273 sf | 7.20% | 2,353 sf | 2.70% |
| 8:45 AM | 4,507 sf | 5.17% | 2,014 sf | 2.31% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,222 sf | 4.85% | 875 sf | 1.00% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,036 sf | 4.63% | 30 sf | 0.03% |
| 9:30 AM | 3,857 sf | 4.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,694 sf | 4.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,516 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,340 sf | 3.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,152 sf | 3.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 2,989 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,807 sf | 3.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,650 sf | 3.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,469 sf | 2.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,308 sf | 2.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,127 sf | 2.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 1,973 sf | 2.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,769 sf | 2.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,612 sf | 1.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,364 sf | 1.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,451 sf | 1.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,523 sf | 1.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,661 sf | 1.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,728 sf | 1.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,848 sf | 2.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 1,902 sf | 2.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,006 sf | 2.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,063 sf | 2.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,146 sf | 2.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,197 sf | 2.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,264 sf | 2.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,230 sf | 2.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,455 sf | 2.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,953 sf | 3.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,470 sf | 3.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,046 sf | 4.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,679 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,407 sf | 6.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,230 sf | 7.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,192 sf | 8.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,321 sf | 9.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,741 sf | 11.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,553 sf | 13.26% | 223 sf | 0.26% |
| 7:00 PM | 13,976 sf | 16.04% | 1,556 sf | 1.79% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,471 sf | 20.05% | 5,228 sf | 6.00% |
| 7:36 PM | 28,841 sf | 33.10% | 10,732 sf | 12.32% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 5

Mirror date: June 7
Analysis hours: 6:52 AM-7:36 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:52 AM | 53,801 sf | 61.75% | 2,547 sf | 2.92% |
| 7:00 AM | 41,891 sf | 48.08% | 4,088 sf | 4.69% |
| 7:15 AM | 29,973 sf | 34.40% | 3,979 sf | 4.57% |
| 7:30 AM | 23,337 sf | 26.79% | 3,577 sf | 4.11% |
| 7:45 AM | 18,182 sf | 20.87% | 3,252 sf | 3.73% |
| 8:00 AM | 13,674 sf | 15.70% | 2,949 sf | 3.39% |
| 8:15 AM | 9,879 sf | 11.34% | 2,662 sf | 3.06% |
| 8:30 AM | 6,755 sf | 7.75% | 2,412 sf | 2.77% |
| 8:45 AM | 4,826 sf | 5.54% | 2,115 sf | 2.43% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,330 sf | 4.97% | 1,079 sf | 1.24% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,139 sf | 4.75% | 107 sf | 0.12% |
| 9:30 AM | 3,954 sf | 4.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,782 sf | 4.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,600 sf | 4.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,421 sf | 3.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,230 sf | 3.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,063 sf | 3.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,880 sf | 3.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,722 sf | 3.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,539 sf | 2.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,377 sf | 2.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,192 sf | 2.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,041 sf | 2.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,835 sf | 2.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,675 sf | 1.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,424 sf | 1.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,483 sf | 1.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,568 sf | 1.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,705 sf | 1.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,776 sf | 2.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,894 sf | 2.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 1,956 sf | 2.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,062 sf | 2.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,117 sf | 2.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,204 sf | 2.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,256 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,337 sf | 2.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,358 sf | 2.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,466 sf | 2.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,885 sf | 3.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,408 sf | 3.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,984 sf | 4.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,615 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,340 sf | 6.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,165 sf | 7.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,127 sf | 8.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,255 sf | 9.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,671 sf | 11.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,478 sf | 13.17% | 170 sf | 0.20% |
| 7:00 PM | 13,898 sf | 15.95% | 1,396 sf | 1.60% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,367 sf | 19.94% | 4,992 sf | 5.73% |
| 7:36 PM | 28,122 sf | 32.28% | 10,951 sf | 12.57% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 12

Mirror date: May 31
Analysis hours: 6:56 AM-7:33 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:56 AM | 53,097 sf | 60.95% | 2,408 sf | 2.76% |
| 7:00 AM | 47,045 sf | 54.00% | 3,395 sf | 3.90% |
| 7:15 AM | 32,076 sf | 36.82% | 4,194 sf | 4.81% |
| 7:30 AM | 24,775 sf | 28.44% | 3,764 sf | 4.32% |
| 7:45 AM | 19,251 sf | 22.10% | 3,412 sf | 3.92% |
| 8:00 AM | 14,578 sf | 16.73% | 3,072 sf | 3.53% |
| 8:15 AM | 10,583 sf | 12.15% | 2,769 sf | 3.18% |
| 8:30 AM | 7,405 sf | 8.50% | 2,490 sf | 2.86% |
| 8:45 AM | 5,297 sf | 6.08% | 2,234 sf | 2.56% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,503 sf | 5.17% | 1,333 sf | 1.53% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,299 sf | 4.93% | 244 sf | 0.28% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,099 sf | 4.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,921 sf | 4.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,732 sf | 4.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,545 sf | 4.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,347 sf | 3.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,178 sf | 3.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,989 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,825 sf | 3.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,640 sf | 3.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,482 sf | 2.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,290 sf | 2.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,134 sf | 2.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,930 sf | 2.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,769 sf | 2.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,511 sf | 1.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,552 sf | 1.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,648 sf | 1.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,788 sf | 2.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,857 sf | 2.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,980 sf | 2.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,043 sf | 2.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,144 sf | 2.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,204 sf | 2.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,300 sf | 2.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,352 sf | 2.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,434 sf | 2.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,473 sf | 2.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,494 sf | 2.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,739 sf | 3.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,340 sf | 3.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,920 sf | 4.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,559 sf | 5.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,289 sf | 6.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,121 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,093 sf | 8.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,235 sf | 9.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,661 sf | 11.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,496 sf | 13.20% | 125 sf | 0.14% |
| 7:00 PM | 13,972 sf | 16.04% | 1,296 sf | 1.49% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,555 sf | 20.15% | 5,128 sf | 5.89% |
| 7:33 PM | 26,959 sf | 30.95% | 11,312 sf | 12.98% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 19

Mirror date: May 24
Analysis hours: 7:01 AM-7:30 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:01 AM | 52,271 sf | 60.00% | 2,281 sf | 2.62% |
| 7:16 AM | 33,985 sf | 39.01% | 4,487 sf | 5.15% |
| 7:30 AM | 26,609 sf | 30.54% | 4,026 sf | 4.62% |
| 7:45 AM | 20,576 sf | 23.62% | 3,616 sf | 4.15% |
| 8:00 AM | 15,675 sf | 17.99% | 3,246 sf | 3.73% |
| 8:15 AM | 11,348 sf | 13.03% | 2,894 sf | 3.32% |
| 8:30 AM | 8,334 sf | 9.57% | 2,614 sf | 3.00% |
| 8:45 AM | 5,925 sf | 6.80% | 2,348 sf | 2.69% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,748 sf | 5.45% | 1,645 sf | 1.89% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,521 sf | 5.19% | 435 sf | 0.50% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,297 sf | 4.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,101 sf | 4.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,908 sf | 4.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,712 sf | 4.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,506 sf | 4.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,328 sf | 3.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,134 sf | 3.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,966 sf | 3.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,777 sf | 3.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,612 sf | 3.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,418 sf | 2.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,259 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,055 sf | 2.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,889 sf | 2.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,634 sf | 1.88% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,667 sf | 1.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,764 sf | 2.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,906 sf | 2.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,976 sf | 2.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,103 sf | 2.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,169 sf | 2.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,279 sf | 2.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,341 sf | 2.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,433 sf | 2.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,495 sf | 2.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,579 sf | 2.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,632 sf | 3.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,708 sf | 3.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,796 sf | 3.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,271 sf | 3.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,867 sf | 4.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,521 sf | 5.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,258 sf | 6.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,110 sf | 7.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,108 sf | 8.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,283 sf | 9.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,748 sf | 11.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,658 sf | 13.38% | 95 sf | 0.11% |
| 7:00 PM | 14,252 sf | 16.36% | 1,311 sf | 1.50% |
| 7:15 PM | 18,041 sf | 20.71% | 5,948 sf | 6.83% |
| 7:30 PM | 25,516 sf | 29.29% | 11,670 sf | 13.39% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 26

Mirror date: May 17
Analysis hours: 7:07 AM-7:25 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:07 AM | 51,090 sf | 58.64% | 2,572 sf | 2.95% |
| 7:15 AM | 38,869 sf | 44.62% | 4,946 sf | 5.68% |
| 7:30 AM | 29,015 sf | 33.30% | 4,396 sf | 5.05% |
| 7:45 AM | 22,226 sf | 25.51% | 3,892 sf | 4.47% |
| 8:00 AM | 17,041 sf | 19.56% | 3,464 sf | 3.98% |
| 8:15 AM | 12,600 sf | 14.46% | 3,080 sf | 3.54% |
| 8:30 AM | 9,453 sf | 10.85% | 2,749 sf | 3.16% |
| 8:45 AM | 6,765 sf | 7.77% | 2,461 sf | 2.82% |
| 9:00 AM | 5,085 sf | 5.84% | 1,979 sf | 2.27% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,794 sf | 5.50% | 709 sf | 0.81% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,553 sf | 5.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,336 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 4,121 sf | 4.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,918 sf | 4.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,704 sf | 4.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,517 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,313 sf | 3.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,139 sf | 3.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,940 sf | 3.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,774 sf | 3.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,575 sf | 2.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,411 sf | 2.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,204 sf | 2.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,039 sf | 2.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,783 sf | 2.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,826 sf | 2.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,921 sf | 2.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,063 sf | 2.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,139 sf | 2.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,261 sf | 2.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,336 sf | 2.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,452 sf | 2.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,518 sf | 2.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,619 sf | 3.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,681 sf | 3.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,775 sf | 3.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,839 sf | 3.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,913 sf | 3.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,900 sf | 3.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,172 sf | 3.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,822 sf | 4.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,489 sf | 5.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,251 sf | 6.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,127 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,164 sf | 8.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,391 sf | 9.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,922 sf | 11.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,942 sf | 13.71% | 76 sf | 0.09% |
| 7:00 PM | 14,750 sf | 16.93% | 2,024 sf | 2.32% |
| 7:15 PM | 18,880 sf | 21.67% | 7,511 sf | 8.62% |
| 7:25 PM | 23,869 sf | 27.40% | 11,981 sf | 13.75% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 2

Mirror date: May 10
Analysis hours: 7:12 AM-7:18 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:12 AM | 48,899 sf | 56.13% | 3,210 sf | 3.68% |
| 7:15 AM | 44,825 sf | 51.45% | 4,215 sf | 4.84% |
| 7:30 AM | 31,918 sf | 36.64% | 4,868 sf | 5.59% |
| 7:45 AM | 24,175 sf | 27.75% | 4,263 sf | 4.89% |
| 8:00 AM | 18,553 sf | 21.30% | 3,728 sf | 4.28% |
| 8:15 AM | 14,279 sf | 16.39% | 3,295 sf | 3.78% |
| 8:30 AM | 10,743 sf | 12.33% | 2,923 sf | 3.36% |
| 8:45 AM | 7,817 sf | 8.97% | 2,600 sf | 2.98% |
| 9:00 AM | 5,672 sf | 6.51% | 2,244 sf | 2.58% |
| 9:15 AM | 5,131 sf | 5.89% | 1,027 sf | 1.18% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,852 sf | 5.57% | 31 sf | 0.04% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,613 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 4,376 sf | 5.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 4,168 sf | 4.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,937 sf | 4.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,739 sf | 4.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,523 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,342 sf | 3.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,133 sf | 3.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,962 sf | 3.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,757 sf | 3.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,591 sf | 2.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,382 sf | 2.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,210 sf | 2.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,959 sf | 2.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,024 sf | 2.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,120 sf | 2.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,258 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,339 sf | 2.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,465 sf | 2.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,542 sf | 2.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,661 sf | 3.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,738 sf | 3.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,844 sf | 3.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,912 sf | 3.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 3,018 sf | 3.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 3,086 sf | 3.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 3,193 sf | 3.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,263 sf | 3.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,320 sf | 3.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,739 sf | 4.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,484 sf | 5.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,284 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,195 sf | 7.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,291 sf | 8.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,600 sf | 9.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 10,238 sf | 11.75% | 20 sf | 0.02% |
| 6:45 PM | 12,439 sf | 14.28% | 571 sf | 0.66% |
| 7:00 PM | 15,579 sf | 17.88% | 3,668 sf | 4.21% |
| 7:15 PM | 20,473 sf | 23.50% | 9,975 sf | 11.45% |
| 7:18 PM | 22,329 sf | 25.63% | 11,739 sf | 13.47% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 9

Mirror date: May 3
Analysis hours: 7:19 AM-7:10 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:19 AM | 47,564 sf | 54.60% | 3,935 sf | 4.52% |
| 7:30 AM | 35,705 sf | 40.98% | 5,440 sf | 6.24% |
| 7:45 AM | 26,531 sf | 30.45% | 4,730 sf | 5.43% |
| 8:00 AM | 20,849 sf | 23.93% | 4,088 sf | 4.69% |
| 8:15 AM | 16,239 sf | 18.64% | 3,560 sf | 4.09% |
| 8:30 AM | 12,269 sf | 14.08% | 3,131 sf | 3.59% |
| 8:45 AM | 9,041 sf | 10.38% | 2,768 sf | 3.18% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,489 sf | 7.45% | 2,425 sf | 2.78% |
| 9:15 AM | 5,524 sf | 6.34% | 1,383 sf | 1.59% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,210 sf | 5.98% | 162 sf | 0.19% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,940 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 4,678 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 4,449 sf | 5.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 4,206 sf | 4.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,993 sf | 4.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,769 sf | 4.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,570 sf | 4.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,356 sf | 3.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,181 sf | 3.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,969 sf | 3.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,796 sf | 3.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,582 sf | 2.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,405 sf | 2.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,161 sf | 2.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,255 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,348 sf | 2.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,489 sf | 2.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,572 sf | 2.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,707 sf | 3.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,790 sf | 3.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,916 sf | 3.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,993 sf | 3.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 3,113 sf | 3.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 3,195 sf | 3.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 3,308 sf | 3.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 3,388 sf | 3.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 3,499 sf | 4.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,591 sf | 4.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,715 sf | 4.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,848 sf | 4.42% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,499 sf | 5.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,347 sf | 6.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,322 sf | 7.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,490 sf | 8.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,906 sf | 10.22% | 38 sf | 0.04% |
| 6:30 PM | 10,707 sf | 12.29% | 646 sf | 0.74% |
| 6:45 PM | 13,191 sf | 15.14% | 1,973 sf | 2.26% |
| 7:10 PM | 20,827 sf | 23.91% | 11,528 sf | 13.23% |

SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 16

Mirror date: April 26
Analysis hours: 7:25 AM-7:02 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:25 AM | 47,761 sf | 54.82% | 4,668 sf | 5.36% |
| 7:30 AM | 41,320 sf | 47.43% | 5,845 sf | 6.71% |
| 7:45 AM | 30,535 sf | 35.05% | 5,324 sf | 6.11% |
| 8:00 AM | 23,646 sf | 27.14% | 4,536 sf | 5.21% |
| 8:15 AM | 18,585 sf | 21.33% | 3,889 sf | 4.46% |
| 8:30 AM | 14,077 sf | 16.16% | 3,376 sf | 3.88% |
| 8:45 AM | 10,458 sf | 12.00% | 2,964 sf | 3.40% |
| 9:00 AM | 7,514 sf | 8.62% | 2,604 sf | 2.99% |
| 9:15 AM | 5,982 sf | 6.87% | 1,796 sf | 2.06% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,623 sf | 6.45% | 383 sf | 0.44% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,318 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,027 sf | 5.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 4,774 sf | 5.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 4,509 sf | 5.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,281 sf | 4.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,052 sf | 4.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,842 sf | 4.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,612 sf | 4.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,421 sf | 3.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 3,203 sf | 3.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,026 sf | 3.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,811 sf | 3.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,630 sf | 3.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,394 sf | 2.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,524 sf | 2.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,617 sf | 3.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,760 sf | 3.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,850 sf | 3.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,986 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 3,074 sf | 3.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 3,210 sf | 3.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 3,298 sf | 3.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 3,431 sf | 3.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 3,519 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 3,645 sf | 4.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 3,749 sf | 4.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 3,879 sf | 4.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,999 sf | 4.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 4,134 sf | 4.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,283 sf | 4.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,533 sf | 5.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,442 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,492 sf | 7.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,765 sf | 8.91% | 81 sf | 0.09% |
| 6:15 PM | 9,339 sf | 10.72% | 840 sf | 0.96% |
| 6:30 PM | 11,363 sf | 13.04% | 2,115 sf | 2.43% |
| 6:45 PM | 14,244 sf | 16.35% | 3,921 sf | 4.50% |
| 7:02 PM | 19,740 sf | 22.66% | 11,497 sf | 13.20% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 23

Mirror date: April 19
Analysis hours: 7:31 AM-6:52 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:31 AM | 49,794 sf | 57.16% | 5,555 sf | 6.38% |
| 7:45 AM | 35,845 sf | 41.14% | 5,990 sf | 6.88% |
| 8:00 AM | 26,999 sf | 30.99% | 5,084 sf | 5.84% |
| 8:15 AM | 21,114 sf | 24.24% | 4,292 sf | 4.93% |
| 8:30 AM | 16,082 sf | 18.46% | 3,674 sf | 4.22% |
| 8:45 AM | 12,020 sf | 13.80% | 3,182 sf | 3.65% |
| 9:00 AM | 8,672 sf | 9.95% | 2,776 sf | 3.19% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,533 sf | 7.50% | 2,192 sf | 2.52% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,083 sf | 6.98% | 646 sf | 0.74% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,739 sf | 6.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,409 sf | 6.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,131 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 4,843 sf | 5.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,602 sf | 5.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,341 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,132 sf | 4.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,892 sf | 4.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,696 sf | 4.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 3,471 sf | 3.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,284 sf | 3.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,059 sf | 3.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,867 sf | 3.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,667 sf | 3.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,825 sf | 3.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,926 sf | 3.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 3,069 sf | 3.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 3,164 sf | 3.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 3,304 sf | 3.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 3,407 sf | 3.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 3,551 sf | 4.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 3,655 sf | 4.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 3,794 sf | 4.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 3,904 sf | 4.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 4,052 sf | 4.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 4,165 sf | 4.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 4,327 sf | 4.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 4,458 sf | 5.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 4,647 sf | 5.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,824 sf | 5.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 5,061 sf | 5.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,505 sf | 6.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,760 sf | 7.76% | 168 sf | 0.19% |
| 6:00 PM | 8,184 sf | 9.39% | 1,072 sf | 1.23% |
| 6:15 PM | 9,975 sf | 11.45% | 2,417 sf | 2.77% |
| 6:30 PM | 12,345 sf | 14.17% | 4,204 sf | 4.83% |
| 6:45 PM | 16,012 sf | 18.38% | 7,130 sf | 8.18% |
| 6:52 PM | 19,022 sf | 21.83% | 11,173 sf | 12.82% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 30

Mirror date: April 12
Analysis hours: 7:37 AM-6:42 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:37 AM | 51,378 sf | 58.97% | 6,128 sf | 7.03% |
| 7:45 AM | 42,077 sf | 48.30% | 6,569 sf | 7.54% |
| 8:00 AM | 31,050 sf | 35.64% | 5,750 sf | 6.60% |
| 8:15 AM | 23,975 sf | 27.52% | 4,748 sf | 5.45% |
| 8:30 AM | 18,431 sf | 21.16% | 3,986 sf | 4.58% |
| 8:45 AM | 13,812 sf | 15.85% | 3,398 sf | 3.90% |
| 9:00 AM | 10,078 sf | 11.57% | 2,926 sf | 3.36% |
| 9:15 AM | 7,344 sf | 8.43% | 2,468 sf | 2.83% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,600 sf | 7.58% | 976 sf | 1.12% |
| 9:45 AM | 6,204 sf | 7.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,837 sf | 6.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,526 sf | 6.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,216 sf | 5.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,950 sf | 5.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,674 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,450 sf | 5.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,196 sf | 4.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,989 sf | 4.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 3,759 sf | 4.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,567 sf | 4.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,338 sf | 3.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 3,147 sf | 3.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,985 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 3,168 sf | 3.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 3,268 sf | 3.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 3,418 sf | 3.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 3,516 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 3,673 sf | 4.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 3,782 sf | 4.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 3,934 sf | 4.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 4,052 sf | 4.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 4,215 sf | 4.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 4,340 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 4,507 sf | 5.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 4,653 sf | 5.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 4,844 sf | 5.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 5,019 sf | 5.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 5,239 sf | 6.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 5,496 sf | 6.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 5,783 sf | 6.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 6,102 sf | 7.00% | 265 sf | 0.30% |
| 5:45 PM | 7,111 sf | 8.16% | 1,248 sf | 1.43% |
| 6:00 PM | 8,743 sf | 10.04% | 2,673 sf | 3.07% |
| 6:15 PM | 10,847 sf | 12.45% | 4,619 sf | 5.30% |
| 6:30 PM | 13,976 sf | 16.04% | 7,537 sf | 8.65% |
| 6:42 PM | 18,780 sf | 21.56% | 10,984 sf | 12.61% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 6

Mirror date: April 5
Analysis hours: 7:44 AM-6:31 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:44 AM | 51,583 sf | 59.21% | 6,349 sf | 7.29% |
| 8:00 AM | 35,558 sf | 40.82% | 6,199 sf | 7.12% |
| 8:15 AM | 27,140 sf | 31.15% | 5,098 sf | 5.85% |
| 8:30 AM | 21,004 sf | 24.11% | 4,222 sf | 4.85% |
| 8:45 AM | 15,770 sf | 18.10% | 3,569 sf | 4.10% |
| 9:00 AM | 11,600 sf | 13.32% | 3,055 sf | 3.51% |
| 9:15 AM | 8,406 sf | 9.65% | 2,619 sf | 3.01% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,169 sf | 8.23% | 1,322 sf | 1.52% |
| 9:45 AM | 6,717 sf | 7.71% | 35 sf | 0.04% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,300 sf | 7.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,963 sf | 6.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,617 sf | 6.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,334 sf | 6.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,043 sf | 5.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,802 sf | 5.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,538 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,315 sf | 4.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,074 sf | 4.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,874 sf | 4.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,640 sf | 4.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 3,403 sf | 3.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 3,367 sf | 3.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 3,544 sf | 4.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 3,646 sf | 4.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 3,800 sf | 4.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 3,913 sf | 4.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 4,072 sf | 4.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 4,193 sf | 4.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 4,370 sf | 5.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 4,501 sf | 5.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 4,683 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 4,830 sf | 5.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 5,036 sf | 5.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 5,217 sf | 5.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 5,444 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 5,666 sf | 6.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 5,950 sf | 6.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 6,254 sf | 7.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 6,630 sf | 7.61% | 396 sf | 0.45% |
| 5:30 PM | 7,134 sf | 8.19% | 1,335 sf | 1.53% |
| 5:45 PM | 7,737 sf | 8.88% | 2,848 sf | 3.27% |
| 6:00 PM | 9,498 sf | 10.90% | 4,921 sf | 5.65% |
| 6:15 PM | 12,376 sf | 14.21% | 8,246 sf | 9.46% |
| 6:31 PM | 18,770 sf | 21.54% | 13,560 sf | 15.56% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 13

Mirror date: March 29
Analysis hours: 7:50 AM-6:21 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:50 AM | 50,273 sf | 57.71% | 6,355 sf | 7.29% |
| 8:00 AM | 39,499 sf | 45.34% | 6,482 sf | 7.44% |
| 8:15 AM | 29,502 sf | 33.86% | 5,471 sf | 6.28% |
| 8:30 AM | 22,804 sf | 26.18% | 4,477 sf | 5.14% |
| 8:45 AM | 17,204 sf | 19.75% | 3,746 sf | 4.30% |
| 9:00 AM | 12,773 sf | 14.66% | 3,183 sf | 3.65% |
| 9:15 AM | 9,286 sf | 10.66% | 2,730 sf | 3.13% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,542 sf | 8.66% | 1,693 sf | 1.94% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,088 sf | 8.14% | 170 sf | 0.19% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,704 sf | 7.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,361 sf | 7.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,063 sf | 6.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,761 sf | 6.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,448 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,181 sf | 5.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,898 sf | 5.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,672 sf | 5.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,420 sf | 5.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,214 sf | 4.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,970 sf | 4.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 3,751 sf | 4.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 3,791 sf | 4.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 3,956 sf | 4.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 4,063 sf | 4.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 4,226 sf | 4.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 4,346 sf | 4.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 4,524 sf | 5.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 4,658 sf | 5.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 4,847 sf | 5.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 5,003 sf | 5.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 5,213 sf | 5.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 5,394 sf | 6.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 5,629 sf | 6.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 5,852 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 6,139 sf | 7.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 6,418 sf | 7.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 6,788 sf | 7.79% | 36 sf | 0.04% |
| 5:00 PM | 7,188 sf | 8.25% | 518 sf | 0.59% |
| 5:15 PM | 7,717 sf | 8.86% | 1,419 sf | 1.63% |
| 5:30 PM | 8,362 sf | 9.60% | 2,769 sf | 3.18% |
| 5:45 PM | 9,273 sf | 10.64% | 5,045 sf | 5.79% |
| 6:00 PM | 10,898 sf | 12.51% | 8,608 sf | 9.88% |
| 6:15 PM | 16,029 sf | 18.40% | 13,134 sf | 15.08% |
| 6:21 PM | 18,876 sf | 21.67% | 16,664 sf | 19.13% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 20

Fall equinox (Spring equinox on March 22 similar)
Analysis hours: 7:57 AM-6:09 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:57 AM | 48,971 sf | 56.21% | 6,393 sf | 7.34% |
| 8:00 AM | 44,700 sf | 51.31% | 6,801 sf | 7.81% |
| 8:15 AM | 32,008 sf | 36.74% | 5,865 sf | 6.73% |
| 8:30 AM | 24,397 sf | 28.00% | 4,773 sf | 5.48% |
| 8:45 AM | 18,510 sf | 21.25% | 3,953 sf | 4.54% |
| 9:00 AM | 13,724 sf | 15.75% | 3,317 sf | 3.81% |
| 9:15 AM | 9,958 sf | 11.43% | 2,829 sf | 3.25% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,589 sf | 8.71% | 2,092 sf | 2.40% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,131 sf | 8.19% | 396 sf | 0.45% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,763 sf | 7.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,427 sf | 7.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,131 sf | 7.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,854 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,600 sf | 6.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,362 sf | 6.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,141 sf | 5.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,939 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,746 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,570 sf | 5.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,334 sf | 4.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,138 sf | 4.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,241 sf | 4.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,404 sf | 5.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 4,516 sf | 5.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 4,690 sf | 5.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 4,822 sf | 5.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,015 sf | 5.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 5,166 sf | 5.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 5,381 sf | 6.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 5,564 sf | 6.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 5,805 sf | 6.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 6,023 sf | 6.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 6,309 sf | 7.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 6,577 sf | 7.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 6,934 sf | 7.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 7,307 sf | 8.39% | 99 sf | 0.11% |
| 4:45 PM | 7,784 sf | 8.93% | 546 sf | 0.63% |
| 5:00 PM | 8,321 sf | 9.55% | 1,360 sf | 1.56% |
| 5:15 PM | 9,028 sf | 10.36% | 2,637 sf | 3.03% |
| 5:30 PM | 9,912 sf | 11.38% | 4,651 sf | 5.34% |
| 5:45 PM | 11,638 sf | 13.36% | 8,117 sf | 9.32% |
| 6:00 PM | 15,343 sf | 17.61% | 13,814 sf | 15.86% |
| 6:09 PM | 19,013 sf | 21.82% | 20,103 sf | 23.08% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 27

Mirror date: March 15
Analysis hours: 8:03 AM-5:58 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:03 AM | 47,524 sf | 54.55% | 6,398 sf | 7.34% |
| 8:15 AM | 35,019 sf | 40.20% | 6,254 sf | 7.18% |
| 8:30 AM | 26,112 sf | 29.97% | 5,127 sf | 5.89% |
| 8:45 AM | 19,923 sf | 22.87% | 4,186 sf | 4.80% |
| 9:00 AM | 14,724 sf | 16.90% | 3,480 sf | 3.99% |
| 9:15 AM | 10,705 sf | 12.29% | 2,948 sf | 3.38% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,691 sf | 8.83% | 2,458 sf | 2.82% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,111 sf | 8.16% | 685 sf | 0.79% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,725 sf | 7.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,401 sf | 7.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,116 sf | 7.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,852 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,614 sf | 6.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,384 sf | 6.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,178 sf | 5.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,985 sf | 5.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,796 sf | 5.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,613 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,431 sf | 5.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,341 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,541 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,738 sf | 5.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 4,926 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,135 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,340 sf | 6.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,552 sf | 6.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 5,727 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 5,966 sf | 6.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 6,182 sf | 7.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 6,460 sf | 7.42% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 6,727 sf | 7.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 7,066 sf | 8.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 7,407 sf | 8.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 7,852 sf | 9.01% | 143 sf | 0.16% |
| 4:30 PM | 8,332 sf | 9.56% | 511 sf | 0.59% |
| 4:45 PM | 8,956 sf | 10.28% | 1,221 sf | 1.40% |
| 5:00 PM | 9,677 sf | 11.11% | 2,395 sf | 2.75% |
| 5:15 PM | 10,670 sf | 12.25% | 4,275 sf | 4.91% |
| 5:30 PM | 12,408 sf | 14.24% | 7,222 sf | 8.29% |
| 5:45 PM | 15,944 sf | 18.30% | 12,848 sf | 14.75% |
| 5:58 PM | 21,172 sf | 24.30% | 22,202 sf | 25.48% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 4

Mirror date: March 8
Analysis hours: 8:09 AM-5:47 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:09 AM | 46,677 sf | 53.58% | 6,434 sf | 7.39% |
| 8:15 AM | 40,180 sf | 46.12% | 6,501 sf | 7.46% |
| 8:30 AM | 28,410 sf | 32.61% | 5,559 sf | 6.38% |
| 8:45 AM | 21,439 sf | 24.61% | 4,472 sf | 5.13% |
| 9:00 AM | 15,853 sf | 18.20% | 3,693 sf | 4.24% |
| 9:15 AM | 11,527 sf | 13.23% | 3,094 sf | 3.55% |
| 9:30 AM | 8,163 sf | 9.37% | 2,599 sf | 2.98% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,075 sf | 8.12% | 1,070 sf | 1.23% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,698 sf | 7.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,372 sf | 7.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,088 sf | 6.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,824 sf | 6.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,583 sf | 6.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,360 sf | 6.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,154 sf | 5.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,957 sf | 5.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,789 sf | 5.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,620 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,443 sf | 5.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,424 sf | 5.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,643 sf | 5.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,875 sf | 5.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 5,088 sf | 5.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,312 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,537 sf | 6.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,795 sf | 6.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 6,050 sf | 6.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 6,350 sf | 7.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 6,654 sf | 7.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 7,007 sf | 8.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 7,384 sf | 8.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 7,820 sf | 8.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 8,307 sf | 9.53% | 119 sf | 0.14% |
| 4:15 PM | 8,892 sf | 10.21% | 440 sf | 0.51% |
| 4:30 PM | 9,517 sf | 10.92% | 1,000 sf | 1.15% |
| 4:45 PM | 10,337 sf | 11.87% | 2,078 sf | 2.38% |
| 5:00 PM | 11,321 sf | 12.99% | 3,797 sf | 4.36% |
| 5:15 PM | 13,160 sf | 15.11% | 6,402 sf | 7.35% |
| 5:30 PM | 16,396 sf | 18.82% | 11,567 sf | 13.28% |
| 5:47 PM | 23,202 sf | 26.63% | 23,546 sf | 27.03% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 11

Mirror date: March 1
Analysis hours: 8:16 AM-5:37 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:16 AM | 47,593 sf | 54.63% | 6,445 sf | 7.40% |
| 8:30 AM | 31,988 sf | 36.72% | 5,996 sf | 6.88% |
| 8:45 AM | 23,183 sf | 26.61% | 4,817 sf | 5.53% |
| 9:00 AM | 17,155 sf | 19.69% | 3,926 sf | 4.51% |
| 9:15 AM | 12,468 sf | 14.31% | 3,266 sf | 3.75% |
| 9:30 AM | 8,774 sf | 10.07% | 2,746 sf | 3.15% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,044 sf | 8.09% | 1,531 sf | 1.76% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,662 sf | 7.65% | 24 sf | 0.03% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,337 sf | 7.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,058 sf | 6.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,801 sf | 6.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,559 sf | 6.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,335 sf | 6.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,131 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,938 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,769 sf | 5.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,596 sf | 5.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,406 sf | 5.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,524 sf | 5.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,743 sf | 5.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,969 sf | 5.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 5,188 sf | 5.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,424 sf | 6.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,675 sf | 6.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,950 sf | 6.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 6,247 sf | 7.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 6,560 sf | 7.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 6,900 sf | 7.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 7,286 sf | 8.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 7,703 sf | 8.84% | 1 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 8,189 sf | 9.40% | 73 sf | 0.08% |
| 4:00 PM | 8,745 sf | 10.04% | 319 sf | 0.37% |
| 4:15 PM | 9,415 sf | 10.81% | 762 sf | 0.87% |
| 4:30 PM | 10,214 sf | 11.72% | 1,657 sf | 1.90% |
| 4:45 PM | 11,226 sf | 12.89% | 3,291 sf | 3.78% |
| 5:00 PM | 12,880 sf | 14.78% | 5,580 sf | 6.41% |
| 5:15 PM | 15,792 sf | 18.13% | 10,343 sf | 11.87% |
| 5:30 PM | 20,669 sf | 23.72% | 18,729 sf | 21.50% |
| 5:37 PM | 24,126 sf | 27.69% | 23,682 sf | 27.18% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 18

Mirror date: February 22
Analysis hours: 8:22 AM-5:27 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:22 AM | 49,356 sf | 56.65% | 6,407 sf | 7.35% |
| 8:30 AM | 39,444 sf | 45.28% | 6,313 sf | 7.25% |
| 8:45 AM | 26,211 sf | 30.09% | 5,247 sf | 6.02% |
| 9:00 AM | 18,682 sf | 21.44% | 4,215 sf | 4.84% |
| 9:15 AM | 13,562 sf | 15.57% | 3,469 sf | 3.98% |
| 9:30 AM | 9,551 sf | 10.96% | 2,890 sf | 3.32% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,027 sf | 8.07% | 2,062 sf | 2.37% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,625 sf | 7.60% | 188 sf | 0.22% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,299 sf | 7.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,024 sf | 6.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,767 sf | 6.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,537 sf | 6.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,315 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,111 sf | 5.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,923 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,755 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,595 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,416 sf | 5.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,591 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,820 sf | 5.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 5,051 sf | 5.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 5,281 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,528 sf | 6.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,787 sf | 6.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 6,079 sf | 6.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 6,391 sf | 7.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 6,728 sf | 7.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 7,097 sf | 8.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 7,511 sf | 8.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 7,978 sf | 9.16% | 15 sf | 0.02% |
| 3:45 PM | 8,511 sf | 9.77% | 190 sf | 0.22% |
| 4:00 PM | 9,128 sf | 10.48% | 492 sf | 0.57% |
| 4:15 PM | 9,887 sf | 11.35% | 1,215 sf | 1.39% |
| 4:30 PM | 10,804 sf | 12.40% | 2,651 sf | 3.04% |
| 4:45 PM | 12,255 sf | 14.07% | 4,803 sf | 5.51% |
| 5:00 PM | 14,625 sf | 16.79% | 8,955 sf | 10.28% |
| 5:15 PM | 18,254 sf | 20.95% | 15,624 sf | 17.93% |
| 5:27 PM | 24,202 sf | 27.78% | 22,907 sf | 26.29% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 25

Mirror date: February 15
Analysis hours: 7:30 AM-4:18 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:30 AM | 51,336 sf | 58.93% | 5,893 sf | 6.76% |
| 7:45 AM | 32,576 sf | 37.39% | 5,790 sf | 6.65% |
| 8:00 AM | 21,547 sf | 24.73% | 4,568 sf | 5.24% |
| 8:15 AM | 14,922 sf | 17.13% | 3,712 sf | 4.26% |
| 8:30 AM | 10,530 sf | 12.09% | 3,061 sf | 3.51% |
| 8:45 AM | 7,289 sf | 8.37% | 2,511 sf | 2.88% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,606 sf | 7.58% | 571 sf | 0.66% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,272 sf | 7.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,002 sf | 6.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,744 sf | 6.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,513 sf | 6.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,299 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,090 sf | 5.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,910 sf | 5.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,749 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,593 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,439 sf | 5.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,654 sf | 5.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,885 sf | 5.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,128 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,367 sf | 6.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,624 sf | 6.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 5,896 sf | 6.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,202 sf | 7.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,528 sf | 7.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 6,893 sf | 7.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,282 sf | 8.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 7,731 sf | 8.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,229 sf | 9.45% | 97 sf | 0.11% |
| 2:45 PM | 8,819 sf | 10.12% | 291 sf | 0.33% |
| 3:00 PM | 9,500 sf | 10.90% | 715 sf | 0.82% |
| 3:15 PM | 10,350 sf | 11.88% | 1,914 sf | 2.20% |
| 3:30 PM | 11,536 sf | 13.24% | 3,813 sf | 4.38% |
| 3:45 PM | 13,493 sf | 15.49% | 7,533 sf | 8.65% |
| 4:00 PM | 16,681 sf | 19.15% | 13,991 sf | 16.06% |
| 4:15 PM | 22,420 sf | 25.73% | 20,793 sf | 23.87% |
| 4:18 PM | 24,096 sf | 27.66% | 21,706 sf | 24.92% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 1

Mirror date: February 8
Analysis hours: 7:36 AM-4:10 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:36 AM | 53,393 sf | 61.29% | 5,303 sf | 6.09% |
| 7:45 AM | 41,612 sf | 47.76% | 5,811 sf | 6.67% |
| 8:00 AM | 27,149 sf | 31.16% | 5,000 sf | 5.74% |
| 8:15 AM | 17,945 sf | 20.60% | 4,002 sf | 4.59% |
| 8:30 AM | 11,806 sf | 13.55% | 3,269 sf | 3.75% |
| 8:45 AM | 8,030 sf | 9.22% | 2,706 sf | 3.11% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,601 sf | 7.58% | 1,129 sf | 1.30% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,254 sf | 7.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,977 sf | 6.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,727 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,495 sf | 6.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,284 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,080 sf | 5.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,898 sf | 5.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,748 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,591 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,485 sf | 5.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,705 sf | 5.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,947 sf | 5.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,195 sf | 5.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,445 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,714 sf | 6.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 5,988 sf | 6.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,314 sf | 7.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,654 sf | 7.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,036 sf | 8.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,451 sf | 8.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 7,934 sf | 9.11% | 28 sf | 0.03% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,468 sf | 9.72% | 119 sf | 0.14% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,107 sf | 10.45% | 266 sf | 0.31% |
| 3:00 PM | 9,853 sf | 11.31% | 1,111 sf | 1.27% |
| 3:15 PM | 10,863 sf | 12.47% | 2,800 sf | 3.21% |
| 3:30 PM | 12,362 sf | 14.19% | 5,846 sf | 6.71% |
| 3:45 PM | 14,775 sf | 16.96% | 11,579 sf | 13.29% |
| 4:00 PM | 19,191 sf | 22.03% | 17,790 sf | 20.42% |
| 4:10 PM | 24,483 sf | 28.10% | 19,556 sf | 22.45% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 8

Mirror date: February 1
Analysis hours: 7:43 AM-4:03 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:43 AM | 55,430 sf | 63.63% | 4,886 sf | 5.61% |
| 7:45 AM | 53,511 sf | 61.42% | 5,070 sf | 5.82% |
| 8:00 AM | 34,979 sf | 40.15% | 5,259 sf | 6.04% |
| 8:15 AM | 23,271 sf | 26.71% | 4,374 sf | 5.02% |
| 8:30 AM | 14,809 sf | 17.00% | 3,524 sf | 4.05% |
| 8:45 AM | 9,424 sf | 10.82% | 2,883 sf | 3.31% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,613 sf | 7.59% | 1,811 sf | 2.08% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,252 sf | 7.18% | 25 sf | 0.03% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,968 sf | 6.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,720 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,492 sf | 6.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,276 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,077 sf | 5.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,901 sf | 5.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,755 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,604 sf | 5.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,514 sf | 5.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,744 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,994 sf | 5.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,251 sf | 6.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,503 sf | 6.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,784 sf | 6.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,066 sf | 6.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,401 sf | 7.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,760 sf | 7.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,173 sf | 8.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,601 sf | 8.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,104 sf | 9.30% | 16 sf | 0.02% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,672 sf | 9.95% | 83 sf | 0.10% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,355 sf | 10.74% | 377 sf | 0.43% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,167 sf | 11.67% | 1,621 sf | 1.86% |
| 3:15 PM | 11,341 sf | 13.02% | 4,143 sf | 4.76% |
| 3:30 PM | 13,065 sf | 15.00% | 8,806 sf | 10.11% |
| 3:45 PM | 16,324 sf | 18.74% | 14,673 sf | 16.84% |
| 4:00 PM | 24,209 sf | 27.79% | 17,105 sf | 19.63% |
| 4:03 PM | 27,281 sf | 31.31% | 16,856 sf | 19.35% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 15

Mirror date: January 25
Analysis hours: 7:51 AM-3:57 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:51 AM | 57,456 sf | 65.95% | 4,431 sf | 5.09% |
| 8:00 AM | 44,494 sf | 51.07% | 5,133 sf | 5.89% |
| 8:15 AM | 29,993 sf | 34.43% | 4,572 sf | 5.25% |
| 8:30 AM | 19,421 sf | 22.29% | 3,823 sf | 4.39% |
| 8:45 AM | 12,326 sf | 14.15% | 3,104 sf | 3.56% |
| 9:00 AM | 7,383 sf | 8.47% | 2,508 sf | 2.88% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,271 sf | 7.20% | 368 sf | 0.42% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,967 sf | 6.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,723 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,494 sf | 6.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,282 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,082 sf | 5.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,904 sf | 5.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,764 sf | 5.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,619 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,538 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,772 sf | 5.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,029 sf | 5.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,292 sf | 6.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,552 sf | 6.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,835 sf | 6.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,127 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,471 sf | 7.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,838 sf | 7.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,253 sf | 8.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,709 sf | 8.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,235 sf | 9.45% | 4 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,834 sf | 10.14% | 54 sf | 0.06% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,552 sf | 10.96% | 602 sf | 0.69% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,422 sf | 11.96% | 2,338 sf | 2.68% |
| 3:15 PM | 11,766 sf | 13.51% | 5,933 sf | 6.81% |
| 3:30 PM | 13,946 sf | 16.01% | 11,220 sf | 12.88% |
| 3:45 PM | 19,955 sf | 22.91% | 14,991 sf | 17.21% |
| 3:57 PM | 31,138 sf | 35.74% | 14,108 sf | 16.19% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 22

Mirror date: January 18
Analysis hours: 7:57 AM-3:54 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:57 AM | 59,462 sf | 68.25% | 4,024 sf | 4.62% |
| 8:00 AM | 56,106 sf | 64.40% | 4,258 sf | 4.89% |
| 8:15 AM | 37,839 sf | 43.43% | 4,598 sf | 5.28% |
| 8:30 AM | 25,145 sf | 28.86% | 4,022 sf | 4.62% |
| 8:45 AM | 16,356 sf | 18.77% | 3,360 sf | 3.86% |
| 9:00 AM | 9,898 sf | 11.36% | 2,721 sf | 3.12% |
| 9:15 AM | 7,077 sf | 8.12% | 1,031 sf | 1.18% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,019 sf | 6.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,735 sf | 6.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,508 sf | 6.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,293 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,094 sf | 5.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,921 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,782 sf | 5.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,642 sf | 5.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,551 sf | 5.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,786 sf | 5.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,042 sf | 5.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,311 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,580 sf | 6.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,869 sf | 6.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,165 sf | 7.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,509 sf | 7.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,887 sf | 7.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,318 sf | 8.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,785 sf | 8.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,321 sf | 9.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,937 sf | 10.26% | 31 sf | 0.04% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,680 sf | 11.11% | 824 sf | 0.95% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,624 sf | 12.20% | 3,146 sf | 3.61% |
| 3:15 PM | 12,246 sf | 14.06% | 7,550 sf | 8.67% |
| 3:30 PM | 15,814 sf | 18.15% | 12,449 sf | 14.29% |
| 3:45 PM | 24,777 sf | 28.44% | 13,761 sf | 15.80% |
| 3:54 PM | 34,860 sf | 40.01% | 11,627 sf | 13.35% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 29

Mirror date: January 11
Analysis hours: 8:04 AM-3:51 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:04 AM | 60,975 sf | 69.99% | 3,790 sf | 4.35% |
| 8:15 AM | 46,327 sf | 53.18% | 4,521 sf | 5.19% |
| 8:30 AM | 31,415 sf | 36.06% | 4,084 sf | 4.69% |
| 8:45 AM | 20,984 sf | 24.09% | 3,555 sf | 4.08% |
| 9:00 AM | 13,129 sf | 15.07% | 2,935 sf | 3.37% |
| 9:15 AM | 8,485 sf | 9.74% | 1,824 sf | 2.09% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,811 sf | 7.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,872 sf | 6.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,532 sf | 6.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,316 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,117 sf | 5.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,940 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,804 sf | 5.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,670 sf | 5.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,546 sf | 5.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,759 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,000 sf | 5.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,294 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,585 sf | 6.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,879 sf | 6.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,178 sf | 7.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,517 sf | 7.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,904 sf | 7.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,335 sf | 8.42% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,810 sf | 8.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,358 sf | 9.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,980 sf | 10.31% | 24 sf | 0.03% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,745 sf | 11.19% | 1,069 sf | 1.23% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,930 sf | 12.55% | 3,847 sf | 4.42% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,003 sf | 14.93% | 8,515 sf | 9.77% |
| 3:30 PM | 17,870 sf | 20.51% | 12,500 sf | 14.35% |
| 3:45 PM | 29,585 sf | 33.96% | 12,017 sf | 13.79% |
| 3:51 PM | 38,226 sf | 43.88% | 9,782 sf | 11.23% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# DECEMBER 6

Mirror date: January 4
Analysis hours: 8:10 AM-3:51 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:10 AM | 62,077 sf | 71.25% | 3,623 sf | 4.16% |
| 8:15 AM | 55,171 sf | 63.33% | 3,964 sf | 4.55% |
| 8:30 AM | 37,834 sf | 43.43% | 4,133 sf | 4.74% |
| 8:45 AM | 25,717 sf | 29.52% | 3,623 sf | 4.16% |
| 9:00 AM | 16,650 sf | 19.11% | 3,157 sf | 3.62% |
| 9:15 AM | 10,386 sf | 11.92% | 2,530 sf | 2.90% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,843 sf | 9.00% | 260 sf | 0.30% |
| 9:45 AM | 6,564 sf | 7.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,653 sf | 6.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,348 sf | 6.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,150 sf | 5.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,967 sf | 5.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,834 sf | 5.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,701 sf | 5.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,542 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,757 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,024 sf | 5.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,298 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,573 sf | 6.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,859 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,163 sf | 7.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,497 sf | 7.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,881 sf | 7.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,318 sf | 8.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,793 sf | 8.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,341 sf | 9.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,961 sf | 10.29% | 23 sf | 0.03% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,870 sf | 11.33% | 1,182 sf | 1.36% |
| 3:00 PM | 11,182 sf | 12.83% | 4,220 sf | 4.84% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,645 sf | 15.66% | 8,831 sf | 10.14% |
| 3:30 PM | 19,347 sf | 22.21% | 12,156 sf | 13.95% |
| 3:45 PM | 32,446 sf | 37.24% | 10,874 sf | 12.48% |
| 3:51 PM | 41,983 sf | 48.19% | 7,815 sf | 8.97% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# DECEMBER 13

Mirror date: December 28
Analysis hours: 8:15 AM-3:52 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:15 AM | 62,797 sf | 72.08% | 3,498 sf | 4.02% |
| 8:30 AM | 44,071 sf | 50.59% | 4,120 sf | 4.73% |
| 8:45 AM | 30,241 sf | 34.71% | 3,724 sf | 4.27% |
| 9:00 AM | 19,954 sf | 22.90% | 3,236 sf | 3.71% |
| 9:15 AM | 12,851 sf | 14.75% | 2,723 sf | 3.13% |
| 9:30 AM | 8,805 sf | 10.11% | 869 sf | 1.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,255 sf | 8.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,109 sf | 7.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,439 sf | 6.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,186 sf | 5.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,998 sf | 5.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,857 sf | 5.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,731 sf | 5.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,548 sf | 5.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,709 sf | 5.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,976 sf | 5.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,253 sf | 6.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,528 sf | 6.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,821 sf | 6.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,123 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,454 sf | 7.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,831 sf | 7.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,258 sf | 8.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,731 sf | 8.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,270 sf | 9.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,933 sf | 10.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,859 sf | 11.32% | 1,062 sf | 1.22% |
| 3:00 PM | 11,281 sf | 12.95% | 4,068 sf | 4.67% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,808 sf | 15.85% | 8,530 sf | 9.79% |
| 3:30 PM | 19,540 sf | 22.43% | 11,753 sf | 13.49% |
| 3:45 PM | 32,452 sf | 37.25% | 10,549 sf | 12.11% |
| 3:52 PM | 44,996 sf | 51.65% | 6,232 sf | 7.15% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# DECEMBER 20

Winter solstice (December 21 similar)
Analysis hours: 8:19 AM-3:54 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:19 AM | 63,052 sf | 72.37% | 3,457 sf | 3.97% |
| 8:30 AM | 49,142 sf | 56.41% | 4,080 sf | 4.68% |
| 8:45 AM | 34,003 sf | 39.03% | 3,810 sf | 4.37% |
| 9:00 AM | 22,611 sf | 25.95% | 3,341 sf | 3.83% |
| 9:15 AM | 14,836 sf | 17.03% | 2,875 sf | 3.30% |
| 9:30 AM | 9,679 sf | 11.11% | 1,488 sf | 1.71% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,787 sf | 8.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,454 sf | 7.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,621 sf | 6.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,229 sf | 6.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,039 sf | 5.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,883 sf | 5.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,765 sf | 5.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,623 sf | 5.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,656 sf | 5.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,923 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,200 sf | 5.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,472 sf | 6.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,762 sf | 6.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,064 sf | 6.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,389 sf | 7.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,753 sf | 7.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,175 sf | 8.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,635 sf | 8.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,165 sf | 9.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,816 sf | 10.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,715 sf | 11.15% | 772 sf | 0.89% |
| 3:00 PM | 11,060 sf | 12.70% | 3,478 sf | 3.99% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,417 sf | 15.40% | 7,731 sf | 8.87% |
| 3:30 PM | 18,450 sf | 21.18% | 11,434 sf | 13.12% |
| 3:45 PM | 30,188 sf | 34.65% | 10,821 sf | 12.42% |
| 3:54 PM | 46,296 sf | 53.14% | 5,558 sf | 6.38% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



# EXHIBIT E

SWAPE Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Matt Hagemann, P.G, C.Hg.
(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

November 14, 2025

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

**Subject:** **Comments on the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program (SCH No. 2021060358)**

Dear Mr. Drury,

We have reviewed the September 2025 Addendum No. 1 to Environmental Impact Report ("Addendum") and the November 2022 Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program ("Project") located in the City of San Francisco ("City"). The Addendum proposes to develop an additional 4,000 housing units to bring the total units under the Family Zoning Plan to 54,000 housing units.

Our review concludes that the Addendum fails to adequately evaluate the Project's hazards, hazardous materials, and air quality impacts. As a result, emissions and health risk impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project may be underestimated and inadequately addressed. A subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") should be prepared to adequately assess and mitigate the potential hazards, hazardous materials, and air quality impacts that the project may have on the environment.

# Hazards and Hazardous Materials

## Inadequate Disclosure and Analysis of Impacts

The Addendum and FEIR do not mention the newly passed AB 130 which mandates that hazardous waste sites be addressed through the completion of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessments ("ESAs"). AB 130 states: [1]

> "The development can proceed as a "use by right" if, [among other provisions],

[1] "Assembly Bill No. 130." California State Legislature, 2025, *available at:* https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB130/id/3258333

(13) (A) The development proponent completes a Phase I environmental assessment, as defined in Section 78090 of the Health and Safety Code, and a Phase II environmental assessment, as defined in subdivision (o) of Section 25403 of the Health and Safety Code, if warranted.

(B) If a recognized environmental condition is found, the development proponent shall undertake a preliminary endangerment assessment, as defined in Section 78095 of the Health and Safety Code, prepared by an environmental assessor to determine the existence of any release of a hazardous substance on the site and to determine the potential for exposure of future occupants to significant health hazards from any nearby property or activity.

(i) If a release of hazardous substance is found to exist on the site, the release shall be removed, or any significant effect of the release shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with state and federal requirements.

(ii) If a potential for exposure to significant hazards from surrounding properties or activities is found to exist, the effects of the potential exposure shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with current state and federal requirements."

These requirements are not mentioned in the Addendum or FEIR. There are thousands of hazardous waste sites in San Francisco. According to the FEIR, there are 2,000 Maher sites and 2,300 Cortese List sites within San Francisco (p. 4.1-219) [2]. All Maher- and Cortese-listed sites that will be subject to development under this Project will need to undergo a Phase I ESA according to the AB 130 text cited above.

Phase I ESAs are conducted to identify if any recognized environmental conditions are found that would potentially pose a health risk to construction workers or for future residents. If a recognized environmental condition is found, a more detailed preliminary endangerment assessment is required to identify any hazardous substance release.

A subsequent EIR should be prepared to include specific mitigation measures for dealing with Maher- and Cortese-listed sites in a manner consistent with AB 130. These mitigation measures must include provisions for conducting Phase I ESAs and, if recognized conditions are found, Phase II ESAs so that the health of construction workers, future occupants and workers is protected.

[2] The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agencyopens in a new window to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. DTSC is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other State and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/

## Air Quality

### Failure to Quantify and Adequately Evaluate Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

The Addendum fails to quantify the criteria air pollutant emissions associated with Project construction and operation. Rather, in regard to the proposed Project's construction-related air quality impacts, the Addendum states:

> "The proposed rezoning program and subsequent development is expected to result in the same significant criteria air pollutant impacts from construction but not substantially more severe impacts than those disclosed in the EIR" (p. 93).

Similarly, in regard to the Project's operational air quality impacts, the Addendum states:

> "The conclusion in the FEIR is that total operational emissions for future development would be below the air district's thresholds of significance for all pollutants. That conclusion also applies to the proposed rezoning program. Operational emissions would not exceed any thresholds for any representative building type that would be constructed under the proposed rezoning program, and the impact would be less than significant" (p. 95).

However, relevant Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("BAAQMD") guidance supports the calculation of the Project's air pollutant emissions. The Addendum proposes to construct an additional 4,000 residential units. According to BAAQMD's screening criteria, apartments and condo-townhouse land uses must undergo further environmental review if they exceed 416 units for construction or 637/638 units for operational emissions (see table below).[3]

[3] "Screening For Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors." BAAQMD, 2022, *available at*: https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-4-screening_final-pdf.pdf?la=en, p. 4.

| Land Use Category | Land Use Subcategory | Land Use Unit | Screening Level | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Construction | Operation |
| Education | Worship Place | KSF | 452 | 642 |
| Industrial | General Heavy Industry | KSF | 452 | 1,009 |
| Industrial | General Light Industry | KSF | 452 | 998 |
| Industrial | Industrial Park | KSF | 452 | 1,247 |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | KSF | 452 | 1,009 |
| Industrial | Warehouse[1] | KSF | 452 | 1,423 |
| Recreational | Arena | KSF | 732 | 600 |
| Recreational | City Park | Acres | 10 | 175 |
| Recreational | Fast Food Restaurant | KSF | 452 | 21 |
| Recreational | Health Club | KSF | 452 | 261 |
| Recreational | Hotel | Rooms | 312 | 633 |
| Recreational | Motel | Rooms | 230 | 767 |
| Recreational | Movie Theater | KSF | 458 | 80 |
| Recreational | Restaurant – High Turnover (Sit-Down) | KSF | 452 | 75 |
| Recreational | Restaurant – Quality (Fine Dining) | KSF | 452 | 105 |
| Recreational | Racquet Club | KSF | 452 | 457 |
| Recreational | Recreational Swimming Pool | KSF | 452 | 376 |
| Residential | Apartments | DU | 416 | 638 |
| Residential | Condo-Townhouse | DU | 416 | 637 |
| Residential | Mobile Home Park | DU | 377 | 721 |
| Residential | Congregate Care/Retirement Community | DU | 416 | 1,008 |
| Residential | Single Family Housing | DU | 254 | 421 |
| Retail | Auto Care Center | KSF | 452 | 356 |
| Retail | Convenience Market | KSF | 452 | 11 |
| Retail | Discount Store | KSF | 452 | 150 |
| Retail | Home Improvement Superstore/Hardware-Paint Store | KSF | 452 | 221 |
| Retail | Regional Shopping Center | KSF | 452 | 221 |
| Retail | Strip Mall | KSF | 452 | 204 |
| Retail | Supermarket | KSF | 452 | 72 |

Notes: DU = dwelling unit; KSF = thousand square feet.

Furthermore, the BAAQMD indicates that if a Project includes any of the listed screening criteria, "then the lead agency would need to perform a detailed assessment of the project's criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions."[4] Thus, pursuant to relevant BAAQMD guidance, a quantitative air quality analysis should be prepared in a subsequent EIR.

Without making an effort to estimate the Project's potential construction-related and operational criteria air pollutant emissions, the Addendum lacks evidence to support the conclusion that the Project's emissions would not exceed the applicable BAAQMD significance thresholds. Until further analysis is provided, we cannot verify the Project would not result in new, significant air quality impacts already addressed in the FEIR. The Project should not be approved until a subsequent EIR is prepared to adequately assess and mitigate the potential air quality impacts that Project construction and operation may have on the surrounding environment.

## SWAPE's Analysis Indicates a Potentially Significant Air Quality Impact

In an effort to estimate construction-related and operational emissions that may result from development of the additional 4,000 housing units under the Addendum, we prepared a preliminary CalEEMod model. Our analysis provides a generalized evaluation of a range of potential residential building types. Specifically, we modeled accounting for 2,000 "Apartments Mid Rise" and 2,000

[4] "Screening For Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors." BAAQMD, 2022, *available at*: https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-4-screening_final-pdf.pdf?la=en, p. 4.

"Condo/Townhouse High Rise" land use subtypes. Because Project-specific details such as construction schedule, equipment types, and operating parameters are not known at this time, all other values were left as default.

Our analysis estimates that the Project's construction and operational related reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds ("ROG/VOC") emissions exceed the BAAQMD daily threshold of 54 pounds per day ("lbs/day") (see table below).

| SWAPE Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Estimates | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Construction ROG/VOC** (lbs/day) | **Operational ROG/VOC** (lbs/day) |
| SWAPE | 148 | 145 |
| **BAAQMD Threshold** | **54** | **54** |
| *Exceeds?* | ***Yes*** | ***Yes*** |

According to our analysis, the construction and operational related ROG/VOC emissions are estimated to be approximately 148 and 145 lbs/day, respectively, exceeding the BAAQMD daily threshold. This finding indicates a potentially significant air quality impact that the Addendum did not identify or address. In our opinion, a subsequent EIR should be conducted to provide a more substantial calculation of the Project's emissions and a more detailed evaluation of the Project's potential air quality impacts.

## Failure to Adequately Account for Air Pollution Exposure Zones

The Addendum proposes development in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, which have areas within the City's air pollutant exposure zones ("APEZ"). The Addendum states that "the proposed rezoning program may result in a small proportion of additional rezoned parcels being in the APEZ, which could increase the number of people exposed to the generally high pollutant concentrations in the APEZ" (p. 97).

In 2025, the City identified new APEZ areas, defined as locations "where particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) is greater than or equal to 9 $\mu g/m^3$ or where the risk of cancer from air pollutants is greater than or equal to 100 in a million," and are displayed in the APEZ map presented below:[5]

[5] "2025 Air Pollutant Exposure Zone." San Francisco Department of Public Health, February 2025, available at: https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/SharedLinks.aspx?accesskey=216571d03e991ee3e00bc434a2415eb36eabc17a8f25a39dc8105f404b976d2f&VaultGUID=A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0.




According to the City:

> "Since 2008, San Francisco Health Code article 38 requires new residential construction projects in the APEZ to install enhanced ventilation in buildings to protect residents from the health effects of poor air quality. In addition, through the environmental review process, many construction projects in the APEZ are required to use the cleanest available construction equipment to reduce air quality impacts."[6][7]

As demonstrated above, residential projects are recommended to install enhanced ventilation in buildings. The Addendum and FEIR have failed to do so. Additionally, the Addendum concludes that the $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk impacts associated with the Project would be significant-and-unavoidable with mitigation, stating:

> "The maximum increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risks would not be meaningfully different than those found in the FEIR analysis, and the results would most likely still be above the air district's thresholds and thus significant and unavoidable with mitigation" (p. 97).

While we agree that the Project would result in significant air quality impacts, the Addendum's assertion that this impact is significant-and-unavoidable is unsupported. The Project proposed by the Addendum would allow further residential development within newly designated APEZ areas, which are already characterized by elevated $PM_{2.5}$ levels and an increased cancer risk. By facilitating new housing in these

[6] "Air Quality Review." San Francisco Planning, 2025, *available at:* https://sfplanning.org/air-quality#permit-anchor-3.
[7] "ARTICLE 38: Enhanced Ventilation for Urban Infill." City and County of San Francisco, December 2008, *available at: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_health/0-0-0-6054*.

areas without committing to additional mitigation, the Addendum could expose future residents to potentially significant health impacts. According to CEQA Guidelines §15096(g)(2):

> "When an updated EIR has been prepared for a project, the Responsible Agency shall not approve the project as proposed if the agency finds any feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures within its powers that would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the project would have on the environment."[8]

As such, the Addendum is required under CEQA to implement all feasible mitigation to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. To reduce the Project's air quality impacts to the maximum extent possible, additional feasible mitigation measures should be incorporated, such as those suggested in the section of this letter titled "Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Emissions." The Project should not be approved until a subsequent EIR is prepared, incorporating all feasible mitigation to reduce emissions to the maximum extent possible.

# Mitigation

## Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Emissions

The Addendum is required under CEQA to implement all feasible mitigation to reduce the Project's potential impacts. As demonstrated above, the Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts that should be mitigated further.

To reduce the VOC emissions associated with Project construction and operation, we recommend the Addendum consider incorporating the following mitigation measures:[9]

- Use super-compliant VOC-content architectural coatings (0 grams per liter to less than 10 grams per liter VOC) during Project construction application of paints and other architectural coatings.
- If paints and coatings with VOC content of 0 grams/liter to less than 10 grams/liter cannot be utilized, or they do not reduce emissions to below thresholds, the developer shall avoid application of architectural coatings during the peak smog season: July, August, and September.

While the Project is not located in Los Angeles County, the above mitigation measures would decrease emissions regardless. Further mitigation used by other land use development projects to address VOC emissions include:[10]

---

[8] "Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15096." California Legislature, available at: https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-14-natural-resources/division-6-resources-agency/chapter-3-guidelines-for-implementation-of-the-california-environmental-quality-act/article-7-eir-process/section-15096-process-for-a-responsible-agency.

[9] "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program." Los Angeles County Housing Element Update Program EIR. August 2021, *available at*: https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Housing_final-peir-mitigation-monitoring.pdf.

[10] "Banning Commerce Center Project." Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., June 2024, *available at*: https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2022090102/2; Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 1-7.

- Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.
- Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.
- For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain
- Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.
- Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.
- Manual application using a paintbrush, hand-roller, trowel, spatula, dauber, rag, or sponge, to achieve a 100 percent application efficiency.

In order to reduce the $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk emissions associated with the Project and recommend the Addendum consider incorporating several mitigation measures as listed below. Incorporating these measures would also reduce cumulative exposure for future residential developments proposed within APEZ zones, where pollutant concentrations are already elevated. The Southern California Association of Governments' Certified Final Program Environmental Impact Report for Connect SoCal 2024 recommends the following Project-level air quality mitigation measures: [11]

- Installing high-efficiency or enhanced filtration units, such as Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 or better. Installation of enhanced filtration units can be verified during occupancy inspection prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.
- Disclose potential health impacts to prospective sensitive receptors from living in close proximity to freeways or other sources of air pollution and the reduced effectiveness of air filtration systems when windows are open or residents are outside.
- Identify the responsible implementing and enforcement agency to ensure that enhanced filtration units are installed on-site before a permit of occupancy is issued.
- Identify the responsible entity such as future residents themselves, Homeowner's Association, or property managers for ensuring enhanced filtration units are replaced on time.
- Identify, provide, and disclose ongoing cost-sharing strategies, if any, for replacing the enhanced filtration units.
- Set criteria for assessing progress in installing and replacing the enhanced filtration units,
- Develop a process for evaluating the effectiveness of the enhanced filtration units.
- Diesel generators on site for more than 10 total days shall be equipped with emission control technology verified by EPA or CARB to reduce PM emissions by a minimum of 85%.

[11] "Certified Final Program Environmental Impact Report for Connect SoCal 2024." SCAG, May 2020, *available at:* https://scag.ca.gov/program-environmental-impact-report-0.

- Establish generator sites and truck-staging zones for vehicles waiting to load or unload material on site. Such zones shall be located where diesel emissions have the least impact on abutters, the general public, and especially sensitive receptors such as hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, elderly housing, and convalescent facilities.
- Obtain CARB Portable Equipment Registration with the state or a local district permit for portable engines and portable engine-driven equipment units used at the project work site, with the exception of on-road and off-road motor vehicles. Arrange appropriate consultations with CARB or the local air district to determine registration and permitting requirements prior to equipment operation at the site.
- Provide pedestrian network improvements, such as interconnected street network, narrower roadways and shorter block lengths, sidewalks, parks and public spaces, minimize pedestrian barriers.
- Create urban non-motorized zones.
- Provide bike parking in non-residential and multi-unit residential projects
- Require residential area parking permit.
- Provide ride-sharing programs:
    - Designate a certain percentage of parking spacing for ride sharing vehicles,
    - Designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles,
    - Providing a web site or messaging board for coordinating rides, and
    - Permanent transportation management association membership and finding requirement.

Provided above are several mitigation measures that would reduce Project-related VOC and $PM_{2.5}$/cancer risk emissions. These measures offer a cost-effective, feasible way to incorporate lower-emitting design features into the proposed Project, which subsequently reduces emissions released during Project construction and operation.

A subsequent EIR should be prepared that includes all feasible mitigation measures, as well as an updated air quality analysis to ensure that the necessary mitigation measures are implemented to reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible. The subsequent EIR should also demonstrate a commitment to the implementation of these measures prior to Project approval, to ensure that the Project's potentially significant emissions are reduced to the maximum extent possible.

## Disclaimer

SWAPE has received limited documentation regarding this project. Additional information may become available in the future; thus, we retain the right to revise or amend this report when additional information becomes available. Our professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable environmental consultants practicing in this or similar localities at the time of service. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the scope of work, work methodologies and protocols, site conditions, analytical testing results, and findings presented. This report reflects efforts which were limited to information that was

reasonably accessible at the time of the work, and may contain informational gaps, inconsistencies, or otherwise be incomplete due to the unavailability or uncertainty of information obtained or provided by third parties.

Sincerely,

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.

Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Attachment A: CalEEMod Output Files
Attachment B: Matt Hagemann CV
Attachment C: Paul Rosenfeld CV

# San Francisco Housing Element Detailed Report

## Table of Contents

1. Basic Project Information

1.1. Basic Project Information

1.2. Land Use Types

1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

2. Emissions Summary

2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

2.5. Operations Emissions by Sector, Unmitigated

3. Construction Emissions Details

3.1. Demolition (2026) - Unmitigated

3.3. Site Preparation (2026) - Unmitigated

3.5. Grading (2026) - Unmitigated

3.7. Grading (2027) - Unmitigated

3.9. Building Construction (2027) - Unmitigated

3.11. Building Construction (2028) - Unmitigated

3.13. Building Construction (2029) - Unmitigated

3.15. Building Construction (2030) - Unmitigated

3.17. Building Construction (2031) - Unmitigated

3.19. Building Construction (2032) - Unmitigated

3.21. Building Construction (2033) - Unmitigated

3.23. Paving (2033) - Unmitigated

3.25. Architectural Coating (2033) - Unmitigated

3.27. Architectural Coating (2034) - Unmitigated

4. Operations Emissions Details

4.1. Mobile Emissions by Land Use

4.1.1. Unmitigated

4.2. Energy

4.2.1. Electricity Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

4.2.3. Natural Gas Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

4.3. Area Emissions by Source

4.3.1. Unmitigated

4.4. Water Emissions by Land Use

4.4.1. Unmitigated

4.5. Waste Emissions by Land Use

4.5.1. Unmitigated

4.6. Refrigerant Emissions by Land Use

4.6.1. Unmitigated

4.7. Offroad Emissions By Equipment Type

4.7.1. Unmitigated

4.8. Stationary Emissions By Equipment Type

4.8.1. Unmitigated

4.9. User Defined Emissions By Equipment Type

4.9.1. Unmitigated

4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

5.5. Architectural Coatings

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

5.7. Construction Paving

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

5.9. Operational Mobile Sources

5.9.1. Unmitigated

5.10. Operational Area Sources

5.10.1. Hearths

5.10.2. Architectural Coatings

5.10.3. Landscape Equipment

5.11. Operational Energy Consumption

5.11.1. Unmitigated

5.12. Operational Water and Wastewater Consumption

5.12.1. Unmitigated

5.13. Operational Waste Generation

5.13.1. Unmitigated

5.14. Operational Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment

5.14.1. Unmitigated

5.15. Operational Off-Road Equipment

5.15.1. Unmitigated

5.16. Stationary Sources

5.16.1. Emergency Generators and Fire Pumps

5.16.2. Process Boilers

5.17. User Defined

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

7. Health and Equity Details

7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

7.4. Health & Equity Measures

7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

8. User Changes to Default Data

8.1. Justifications

# 1. Basic Project Information

## 1.1. Basic Project Information

| Data Field | Value |
|---|---|
| Project Name | San Francisco Housing Element |
| Construction Start Date | 1/1/2026 |
| Operational Year | 2050 |
| Lead Agency | — |
| Land Use Scale | Plan/community |
| Analysis Level for Defaults | County |
| Windspeed (m/s) | 3.9 |
| Precipitation (days) | 42 |
| Location | San Francisco, CA, USA |
| County | San Francisco |
| City | San Francisco |
| Air District | Bay Area AQMD |
| Air Basin | San Francisco Bay Area |
| TAZ | 1047 |
| EDFZ | 1 |
| Electric Utility | Pacific Gas & Electric Company |
| Gas Utility | Pacific Gas & Electric |
| App Version | 2022.1.1.32 |

## 1.2. Land Use Types

| Land Use Subtype | Size | Unit | Lot Acreage | Building Area (sq ft) | Landscape Area (sq ft) | Special Landscape Area (sq ft) | Population | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 2,000 | Dwelling Unit | 53 | 1,920,000 | — | — | 4,660 | — |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 2,000 | Dwelling Unit | 31 | 1,920,000 | — | — | 4,660 | — |

## 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

No measures selected

# 2. Emissions Summary

## 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Un/Mit. | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 493 | 493 | 33 | 121 | 0.10 | 1.2 | 27 | 27 | 1.1 | 10 | 11 | — | 39,740 | 39,740 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 105 | 40,504 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 493 | 493 | 35 | 113 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 27 | 27 | 1.0 | 6.5 | 6.9 | — | 38,384 | 38,384 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 39,270 |
| Average Daily (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 148 | 148 | 23 | 76 | 0.07 | 0.74 | 19 | 19 | 0.68 | 4.5 | 4.8 | — | 26,971 | 26,971 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 29 | 27,454 |
| Annual (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 27 | 27 | 4.2 | 14 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.12 | 0.83 | 0.87 | — | 4,465 | 4,465 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 4.8 | 4,545 |

## 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Year | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily - Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 29 | 29 | 0.06 | 1.2 | 20 | 21 | 1.1 | 10 | 11 | — | 6,776 | 6,776 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.62 | 6,799 |
| 2027 | 11 | 8.6 | 33 | 121 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 27 | 27 | 0.39 | 6.5 | 6.9 | — | 39,740 | 39,740 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 105 | 40,504 |
| 2028 | 11 | 8.4 | 31 | 116 | 0.10 | 0.38 | 27 | 27 | 0.36 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 38,945 | 38,945 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 94 | 39,672 |
| 2029 | 11 | 8.1 | 29 | 111 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 27 | 27 | 0.33 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 38,138 | 38,138 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 84 | 38,850 |
| 2030 | 9.5 | 7.8 | 28 | 107 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 27 | 27 | 0.32 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 37,342 | 37,342 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 74 | 38,018 |
| 2031 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 26 | 104 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 27 | 27 | 0.30 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 36,693 | 36,693 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 65 | 37,333 |
| 2032 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 24 | 101 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 27 | 27 | 0.29 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 35,954 | 35,954 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 57 | 36,583 |
| 2033 | 493 | 493 | 5.9 | 16 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.17 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,730 | 4,730 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 7.6 | 4,750 |
| Daily - Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 27 | 28 | 0.06 | 1.1 | 9.4 | 10 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 4.7 | — | 6,766 | 6,766 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 6,791 |
| 2027 | 11 | 8.5 | 35 | 113 | 0.10 | 1.0 | 27 | 27 | 0.96 | 6.5 | 6.9 | — | 38,384 | 38,384 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 39,270 |
| 2028 | 11 | 8.2 | 33 | 108 | 0.10 | 0.38 | 27 | 27 | 0.36 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 37,614 | 37,614 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 38,471 |
| 2029 | 11 | 7.8 | 31 | 104 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 27 | 27 | 0.33 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 36,830 | 36,830 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 37,685 |
| 2030 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 29 | 100 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 27 | 27 | 0.32 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 36,055 | 36,055 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 36,663 |
| 2031 | 9.1 | 7.4 | 27 | 97 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 27 | 27 | 0.30 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 35,418 | 35,418 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 35,996 |
| 2032 | 8.8 | 7.3 | 26 | 93 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 27 | 27 | 0.29 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 34,697 | 34,697 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 35,273 |
| 2033 | 493 | 493 | 25 | 90 | 0.10 | 0.28 | 27 | 27 | 0.27 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 34,007 | 34,007 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 34,556 |
| 2034 | 493 | 493 | 1.5 | 14 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.01 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,430 | 4,430 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 4,443 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 18 | 18 | 0.03 | 0.74 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 0.68 | 2.7 | 3.4 | — | 3,709 | 3,709 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 3,723 |
| 2027 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 23 | 66 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 16 | 17 | 0.37 | 4.1 | 4.5 | — | 22,553 | 22,553 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 25 | 23,076 |
| 2028 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 23 | 76 | 0.07 | 0.27 | 19 | 19 | 0.25 | 4.5 | 4.8 | — | 26,971 | 26,971 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 29 | 27,454 |
| 2029 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 22 | 73 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 19 | 19 | 0.24 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 26,337 | 26,337 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 26 | 26,813 |
| 2030 | 6.7 | 5.5 | 20 | 69 | 0.07 | 0.24 | 19 | 19 | 0.23 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 25,782 | 25,782 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 23 | 26,237 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2031 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 19 | 67 | 0.07 | 0.23 | 19 | 19 | 0.22 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 25,327 | 25,327 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 20 | 25,759 |
| 2032 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 19 | 65 | 0.07 | 0.22 | 19 | 19 | 0.20 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 24,879 | 24,879 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 17 | 25,307 |
| 2033 | 148 | 148 | 5.0 | 17 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 0.08 | 1.0 | 1.1 | — | 5,689 | 5,689 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 3.4 | 5,760 |
| 2034 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 0.01 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | 0.03 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 26 | 26 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 26 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 0.43 | 0.37 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.12 | 0.49 | 0.61 | — | 614 | 614 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 616 |
| 2027 | 1.2 | 0.93 | 4.2 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 0.07 | 0.75 | 0.82 | — | 3,734 | 3,734 | 0.21 | 0.26 | 4.2 | 3,820 |
| 2028 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 14 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.05 | 0.83 | 0.87 | — | 4,465 | 4,465 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 4.8 | 4,545 |
| 2029 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 13 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.87 | — | 4,360 | 4,360 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 4.3 | 4,439 |
| 2030 | 1.2 | 1.00 | 3.7 | 13 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.86 | — | 4,269 | 4,269 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 3.8 | 4,344 |
| 2031 | 1.2 | 0.95 | 3.5 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.86 | — | 4,193 | 4,193 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 3.3 | 4,265 |
| 2032 | 1.1 | 0.94 | 3.4 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.83 | 0.86 | — | 4,119 | 4,119 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 2.9 | 4,190 |
| 2033 | 27 | 27 | 0.91 | 3.1 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.80 | 0.82 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.21 | — | 942 | 942 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.56 | 954 |
| 2034 | 0.53 | 0.53 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.3 | 4.3 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 4.3 |

## 2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Un/Mit. | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 167 | 161 | 70 | 547 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 147,054 | 148,873 | 189 | 3.7 | 35 | 154,742 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 146 | 141 | 71 | 313 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 143,053 | 144,872 | 189 | 4.0 | 28 | 150,827 |
| Average Daily (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 149 | 145 | 31 | 386 | 0.75 | 1.1 | 76 | 77 | 1.1 | 19 | 20 | 1,819 | 90,932 | 92,751 | 188 | 3.7 | 31 | 98,577 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 27 | 27 | 5.7 | 70 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 14 | 14 | 0.20 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 301 | 15,055 | 15,356 | 31 | 0.61 | 5.1 | 16,321 |

## 2.5. Operations Emissions by Sector, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Sector | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 44 | 41 | 19 | 298 | 0.75 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 76,997 | 76,997 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 7.6 | 77,951 |
| Area | 122 | 119 | 42 | 245 | 0.26 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 0.00 | 50,720 | 50,720 | 0.97 | 0.10 | — | 50,774 |
| Energy | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 18,912 | 18,912 | 2.2 | 0.17 | — | 19,019 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Total | 167 | 161 | 70 | 547 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 147,054 | 148,873 | 189 | 3.7 | 35 | 154,742 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 44 | 41 | 23 | 293 | 0.72 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 73,602 | 73,602 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 0.20 | 74,645 |
| Area | 102 | 99 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Energy | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 18,912 | 18,912 | 2.2 | 0.17 | — | 19,019 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Total | 146 | 141 | 71 | 313 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 143,053 | 144,872 | 189 | 4.0 | 28 | 150,827 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 41 | 38 | 21 | 269 | 0.69 | 0.26 | 76 | 76 | 0.24 | 19 | 20 | — | 70,060 | 70,060 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 71,022 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area | 107 | 107 | 2.0 | 113 | 0.01 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | 0.12 | — | 0.12 | 0.00 | 1,535 | 1,535 | 0.04 | < 0.005 | — | 1,537 |
| Energy | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 18,912 | 18,912 | 2.2 | 0.17 | — | 19,019 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Total | 149 | 145 | 31 | 386 | 0.75 | 1.1 | 76 | 77 | 1.1 | 19 | 20 | 1,819 | 90,932 | 92,751 | 188 | 3.7 | 31 | 98,577 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 7.5 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 49 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 14 | 14 | 0.04 | 3.5 | 3.6 | — | 11,599 | 11,599 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 11,759 |
| Area | 20 | 19 | 0.37 | 21 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.00 | 254 | 254 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 255 |
| Energy | 0.19 | 0.09 | 1.6 | 0.69 | 0.01 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | — | 3,131 | 3,131 | 0.37 | 0.03 | — | 3,149 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 37 | 70 | 108 | 3.8 | 0.09 | — | 231 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 264 | 0.00 | 264 | 26 | 0.00 | — | 923 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Total | 27 | 27 | 5.7 | 70 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 14 | 14 | 0.20 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 301 | 15,055 | 15,356 | 31 | 0.61 | 5.1 | 16,321 |

# 3. Construction Emissions Details

## 3.1. Demolition (2026) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 2.7 | 2.3 | 21 | 19 | 0.03 | 0.84 | — | 0.84 | 0.78 | — | 0.78 | — | 3,427 | 3,427 | 0.14 | 0.03 | — | 3,438 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 2.7 | 2.3 | 21 | 19 | 0.03 | 0.84 | — | 0.84 | 0.78 | — | 0.78 | — | 3,427 | 3,427 | 0.14 | 0.03 | — | 3,438 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.75 | 0.63 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 0.01 | 0.23 | — | 0.23 | 0.21 | — | 0.21 | — | 939 | 939 | 0.04 | 0.01 | — | 942 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.14 | 0.11 | 1.0 | 0.95 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | — | 155 | 155 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 156 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 133 | 133 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.46 | 134 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 126 | 126 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 127 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 34 | 34 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.05 | 35 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 5.7 | 5.7 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 5.8 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.3. Site Preparation (2026) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.7 | 3.1 | 29 | 29 | 0.05 | 1.2 | — | 1.2 | 1.1 | — | 1.1 | — | 5,298 | 5,298 | 0.21 | 0.04 | — | 5,316 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 20 | 20 | — | 10 | 10 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.62 | 0.52 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 0.01 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | — | 871 | 871 | 0.04 | 0.01 | — | 874 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 1.7 | 1.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.87 | 0.86 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 144 | 144 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 145 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.59 | 0.59 | — | 0.30 | 0.30 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 155 | 155 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.54 | 156 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 24 | 24 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | 24 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.0 | 4.0 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 4.1 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.5. Grading (2026) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.6 | 3.0 | 27 | 28 | 0.06 | 1.1 | — | 1.1 | 1.0 | — | 1.0 | — | 6,599 | 6,599 | 0.27 | 0.05 | — | 6,621 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 9.2 | 9.2 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.6 | 3.0 | 27 | 28 | 0.06 | 1.1 | — | 1.1 | 1.0 | — | 1.0 | — | 6,599 | 6,599 | 0.27 | 0.05 | — | 6,621 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 9.2 | 9.2 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.99 | 0.83 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 0.02 | 0.31 | — | 0.31 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | — | 1,795 | 1,795 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,801 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2.5 | 2.5 | — | 0.99 | 0.99 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.18 | 0.15 | 1.4 | 1.4 | < 0.005 | 0.06 | — | 0.06 | 0.05 | — | 0.05 | — | 297 | 297 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 298 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.46 | 0.46 | — | 0.18 | 0.18 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 177 | 177 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.62 | 178 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 168 | 168 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 170 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 46 | 46 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.07 | 46 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 7.6 | 7.6 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 7.7 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.7. Grading (2027) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.5 | 2.9 | 26 | 27 | 0.06 | 1.0 | — | 1.0 | 0.96 | — | 0.96 | — | 6,598 | 6,598 | 0.27 | 0.05 | — | 6,621 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 9.2 | 9.2 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.54 | 0.46 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 0.01 | 0.16 | — | 0.16 | 0.15 | — | 0.15 | — | 1,020 | 1,020 | 0.04 | 0.01 | — | 1,024 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1.4 | 1.4 | — | 0.56 | 0.56 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.72 | 0.77 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 169 | 169 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 169 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.26 | 0.26 | — | 0.10 | 0.10 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 165 | 165 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 167 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 25 | 25 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | 26 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.2 | 4.2 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 4.3 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.9. Building Construction (2027) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 1.0 | 9.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.34 | — | 0.34 | 0.31 | — | 0.31 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 1.0 | 9.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.34 | — | 0.34 | 0.31 | — | 0.31 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.69 | 0.58 | 5.3 | 7.2 | 0.01 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,342 | 1,342 | 0.05 | 0.01 | — | 1,346 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.96 | 1.3 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 222 | 222 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 223 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 8.0 | 7.2 | 5.2 | 94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 25,057 | 25,057 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 80 | 25,204 |
| Vendor | 2.2 | 0.40 | 19 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 12,286 | 12,286 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 25 | 12,895 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 8.0 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,705 | 23,705 | 0.51 | 0.93 | 2.1 | 23,998 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vendor | 2.2 | 0.39 | 20 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 12,282 | 12,282 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 0.65 | 12,866 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13 | 13 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | — | 13,291 | 13,291 | 0.25 | 0.52 | 19 | 13,472 |
| Vendor | 1.2 | 0.22 | 11 | 7.8 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 0.04 | 0.50 | 0.54 | — | 6,875 | 6,875 | 0.93 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 7,208 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.55 | 8.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.55 | — | 2,200 | 2,200 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 3.2 | 2,230 |
| Vendor | 0.22 | 0.04 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.10 | — | 1,138 | 1,138 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 1.0 | 1,193 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.11. Building Construction (2028) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.99 | 8.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.30 | — | 0.30 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,406 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.99 | 8.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.30 | — | 0.30 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,406 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.85 | 0.71 | 6.4 | 9.3 | 0.02 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | — | 1,717 | 1,717 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,723 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.15 | 0.13 | 1.2 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | — | 284 | 284 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 285 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.9 | 7.0 | 4.4 | 90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 24,628 | 24,628 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 72 | 24,767 |
| Vendor | 2.0 | 0.40 | 17 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,919 | 11,919 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 23 | 12,499 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.8 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 81 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,300 | 23,300 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 1.9 | 23,591 |
| Vendor | 2.0 | 0.38 | 18 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,916 | 11,916 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.58 | 12,475 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 16,718 | 16,718 | 0.32 | 0.14 | 22 | 16,789 |
| Vendor | 1.4 | 0.28 | 13 | 9.7 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 8,536 | 8,536 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 7.0 | 8,943 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.70 | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,768 | 2,768 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 3.7 | 2,780 |
| Vendor | 0.26 | 0.05 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,413 | 1,413 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 1.2 | 1,481 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.13. Building Construction (2029) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.97 | 8.6 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | 0.25 | — | 0.25 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.97 | 8.6 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | 0.25 | — | 0.25 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.82 | 0.69 | 6.1 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | 0.18 | — | 0.18 | — | 1,712 | 1,712 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,718 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.15 | 0.13 | 1.1 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 283 | 283 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 284 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.6 | 6.8 | 4.4 | 85 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 24,223 | 24,223 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 64 | 24,352 |
| Vendor | 1.9 | 0.32 | 16 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,518 | 11,518 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 20 | 12,093 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.6 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,917 | 22,917 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 1.7 | 23,208 |
| Vendor | 1.9 | 0.30 | 17 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,517 | 11,517 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.51 | 12,073 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 5.3 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 16,398 | 16,398 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 20 | 16,465 |
| Vendor | 1.4 | 0.21 | 12 | 9.4 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 8,227 | 8,227 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 6.1 | 8,630 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0.69 | 9.9 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,715 | 2,715 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 3.3 | 2,726 |
| Vendor | 0.25 | 0.04 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,362 | 1,362 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 1.0 | 1,429 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.15. Building Construction (2030) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.94 | 8.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.26 | — | 0.26 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.94 | 8.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.26 | — | 0.26 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.80 | 0.67 | 6.0 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,712 | 1,712 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,718 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.15 | 0.12 | 1.1 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 283 | 283 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 284 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.6 | 6.5 | 4.3 | 82 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,839 | 23,839 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 57 | 23,961 |
| Vendor | 1.7 | 0.31 | 15 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,106 | 11,106 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 17 | 11,653 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.6 | 6.5 | 5.4 | 74 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,553 | 22,553 | 0.44 | 0.19 | 1.5 | 22,622 |
| Vendor | 1.7 | 0.30 | 16 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,105 | 11,105 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.45 | 11,636 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.7 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 16,138 | 16,138 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 18 | 16,203 |
| Vendor | 1.2 | 0.21 | 11 | 9.1 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 7,932 | 7,932 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 5.4 | 8,316 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.59 | 9.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,672 | 2,672 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 2.9 | 2,683 |
| Vendor | 0.23 | 0.04 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,313 | 1,313 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.89 | 1,377 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.17. Building Construction (2031) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.92 | 8.1 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.92 | 8.1 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.78 | 0.66 | 5.8 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | 0.16 | — | 0.16 | — | 1,712 | 1,712 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,718 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.14 | 0.12 | 1.1 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 283 | 283 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 284 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker | 6.5 | 6.3 | 3.5 | 79 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,605 | 23,605 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 50 | 23,720 |
| Vendor | 1.6 | 0.31 | 14 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,691 | 10,691 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 15 | 11,208 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.3 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,330 | 22,330 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 1.3 | 22,397 |
| Vendor | 1.6 | 0.30 | 15 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,692 | 10,692 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.39 | 11,194 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.5 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 15,978 | 15,978 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 15 | 16,041 |
| Vendor | 1.2 | 0.21 | 10 | 8.8 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 7,637 | 7,637 | 0.89 | 1.1 | 4.6 | 8,000 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.58 | 9.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,645 | 2,645 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 2.6 | 2,656 |
| Vendor | 0.21 | 0.04 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,264 | 1,264 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.76 | 1,324 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.19. Building Construction (2032) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.90 | 7.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | 0.21 | — | 0.21 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.90 | 7.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | 0.21 | — | 0.21 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.77 | 0.64 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.16 | — | 0.16 | 0.15 | — | 0.15 | — | 1,717 | 1,717 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,723 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.14 | 0.12 | 1.0 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 284 | 284 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 285 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.3 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,278 | 23,278 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 44 | 23,387 |
| Vendor | 1.5 | 0.31 | 13 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,279 | 10,279 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 13 | 10,791 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker | 6.3 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,020 | 22,020 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 1.1 | 22,087 |
| Vendor | 1.5 | 0.30 | 14 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,280 | 10,280 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.33 | 10,780 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.4 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 15,800 | 15,800 | 0.23 | 0.14 | 14 | 15,860 |
| Vendor | 1.1 | 0.21 | 9.7 | 8.5 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 7,363 | 7,363 | 0.83 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 7,725 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.58 | 8.7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,616 | 2,616 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 2.2 | 2,626 |
| Vendor | 0.19 | 0.04 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,219 | 1,219 | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.65 | 1,279 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.21. Building Construction (2033) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.0 | 0.88 | 7.7 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Off-Road | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.87 | 1.5 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | — | 272 | 272 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 273 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.26 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 45 | 45 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 45 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.1 | 5.9 | 4.4 | 66 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 21,738 | 21,738 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.99 | 21,805 |
| Vendor | 1.4 | 0.30 | 13 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 9,872 | 9,872 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.28 | 10,347 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.41 | 7.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.62 | — | 2,472 | 2,472 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 1.9 | 2,481 |
| Vendor | 0.16 | 0.03 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.11 | — | 1,120 | 1,120 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.52 | 1,175 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 1.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | — | 409 | 409 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | 0.31 | 411 |
| Vendor | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.24 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.06 | 0.06 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 185 | 185 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 194 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.23. Paving (2033) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.70 | 0.59 | 5.9 | 9.8 | 0.01 | 0.18 | — | 0.18 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,511 | 1,511 | 0.06 | 0.01 | — | 1,516 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.70 | 0.59 | 5.9 | 9.8 | 0.01 | 0.18 | — | 0.18 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,511 | 1,511 | 0.06 | 0.01 | — | 1,516 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.21 | 0.18 | 1.8 | 3.0 | < 0.005 | 0.06 | — | 0.06 | 0.05 | — | 0.05 | — | 455 | 455 | 0.02 | < 0.005 | — | 457 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.54 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 75 | 75 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 76 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 120 | 120 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.20 | 120 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 113 | 113 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 114 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 34 | 34 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | 34 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 5.7 | 5.7 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 5.7 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.25. Architectural Coating (2033) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.76 | 1.1 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 134 | 134 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 134 |
| Architectural Coatings | 492 | 492 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.76 | 1.1 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 134 | 134 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 134 |
| Architectural Coatings | 492 | 492 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.33 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 40 | 40 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 40 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architectural Coating | 146 | 146 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.01 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | 0.06 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 6.6 | 6.6 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 6.6 |
| Architectural Coatings | 27 | 27 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.69 | 15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,596 | 4,596 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 7.6 | 4,616 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.89 | 13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,348 | 4,348 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 4,361 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 3.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 | — | 1,296 | 1,296 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.98 | 1,300 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | — | 214 | 214 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.16 | 215 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.27. Architectural Coating (2034) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.76 | 1.1 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 134 | 134 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 134 |
| Architectural Coatings | 492 | 492 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 0.78 | 0.78 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 0.79 |
| Architectural Coatings | 2.9 | 2.9 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 0.13 | 0.13 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 0.13 |
| Architectural Coatings | 0.53 | 0.53 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.74 | 13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,296 | 4,296 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 4,309 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 25 | 25 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 25 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.2 | 4.2 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 4.2 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

# 4. Operations Emissions Details

## 4.1. Mobile Emissions by Land Use

### 4.1.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 22 | 20 | 9.7 | 149 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 38,498 | 38,498 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 38,975 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 22 | 20 | 9.7 | 149 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 38,498 | 38,498 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 38,975 |
| Total | 44 | 41 | 19 | 298 | 0.75 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 76,997 | 76,997 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 7.6 | 77,951 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 22 | 20 | 11 | 146 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 36,801 | 36,801 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.10 | 37,323 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 22 | 20 | 11 | 146 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 36,801 | 36,801 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.10 | 37,323 |
| Total | 44 | 41 | 23 | 293 | 0.72 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 73,602 | 73,602 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 0.20 | 74,645 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.02 | 1.8 | 1.8 | — | 5,800 | 5,800 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 5,879 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.02 | 1.8 | 1.8 | — | 5,800 | 5,800 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 5,879 |
| Total | 7.5 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 49 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 14 | 14 | 0.04 | 3.5 | 3.6 | — | 11,599 | 11,599 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 11,759 |

## 4.2. Energy

### 4.2.1. Electricity Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 7,626 | 7,626 | 1.2 | 0.15 | — | 7,701 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 7,626 | 7,626 | 1.2 | 0.15 | — | 7,701 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 631 | 631 | 0.10 | 0.01 | — | 638 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 631 | 631 | 0.10 | 0.01 | — | 638 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,263 | 1,263 | 0.20 | 0.02 | — | 1,275 |

## 4.2.3. Natural Gas Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Total | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 11,286 | 11,286 | 1.00 | 0.02 | — | 11,318 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Total | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 11,286 | 11,286 | 1.00 | 0.02 | — | 11,318 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.81 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | — | 934 | 934 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | — | 937 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.81 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | — | 934 | 934 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | — | 937 |
| Total | 0.19 | 0.09 | 1.6 | 0.69 | 0.01 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | — | 1,869 | 1,869 | 0.17 | < 0.005 | — | 1,874 |

## 4.3. Area Emissions by Source

### 4.3.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Source | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hearths | 4.6 | 2.3 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Consumer Products | 82 | 82 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architectural Coating | 15 | 15 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Landscape Equipment | 21 | 20 | 2.1 | 228 | 0.01 | 0.10 | — | 0.10 | 0.08 | — | 0.08 | — | 607 | 607 | 0.03 | 0.01 | — | 609 |
| Total | 122 | 119 | 42 | 245 | 0.26 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 0.00 | 50,720 | 50,720 | 0.97 | 0.10 | — | 50,774 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hearths | 4.6 | 2.3 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Consumer Products | 82 | 82 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Architectural Coatings | 15 | 15 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | 102 | 99 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hearths | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.00 | 205 | 205 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 205 |
| Consumer Products | 15 | 15 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Architectural Coatings | 2.7 | 2.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Landscape Equipment | 1.9 | 1.8 | 0.19 | 21 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 50 | 50 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 50 |
| Total | 20 | 19 | 0.37 | 21 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.00 | 254 | 254 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 255 |

## 4.4. Water Emissions by Land Use

### 4.4.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 19 | 35 | 54 | 1.9 | 0.05 | — | 115 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 19 | 35 | 54 | 1.9 | 0.05 | — | 115 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 37 | 70 | 108 | 3.8 | 0.09 | — | 231 |

## 4.5. Waste Emissions by Land Use

### 4.5.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 132 | 0.00 | 132 | 13 | 0.00 | — | 462 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 132 | 0.00 | 132 | 13 | 0.00 | — | 462 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 264 | 0.00 | 264 | 26 | 0.00 | — | 923 |

## 4.6. Refrigerant Emissions by Land Use

### 4.6.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/T High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 4.6 | 4.6 |

## 4.7. Offroad Emissions By Equipment Type

### 4.7.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Equipment Type | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.8. Stationary Emissions By Equipment Type

### 4.8.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Equipment Type | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.9. User Defined Emissions By Equipment Type

### 4.9.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Equipment Type | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

### 4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Vegetation | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

### 4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Species | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Avoided | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Sequestered | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Removed | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Avoided | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Sequestered | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Removed | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Avoided | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Sequestered | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Removed | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

# 5. Activity Data

## 5.1. Construction Schedule

| Phase Name | Phase Type | Start Date | End Date | Days Per Week | Work Days per Phase | Phase Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | Demolition | 1/1/2026 | 5/21/2026 | 5.0 | 100 | — |
| Site Preparation | Site Preparation | 5/22/2026 | 8/14/2026 | 5.0 | 60 | — |
| Grading | Grading | 8/15/2026 | 3/20/2027 | 5.0 | 155 | — |
| Building Construction | Building Construction | 3/21/2027 | 2/27/2033 | 5.0 | 1,550 | — |
| Paving | Paving | 2/28/2033 | 8/1/2033 | 5.0 | 110 | — |
| Architectural Coating | Architectural Coating | 8/2/2033 | 1/3/2034 | 5.0 | 110 | — |

## 5.2. Off-Road Equipment

### 5.2.1. Unmitigated

| Phase Name | Equipment Type | Fuel Type | Engine Tier | Number per Day | Hours Per Day | Horsepower | Load Factor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | Rubber Tired Dozers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 367 | 0.40 |
| Demolition | Excavators | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 8.0 | 36 | 0.38 |
| Demolition | Concrete/Industrial Saws | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 33 | 0.73 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site Preparation | Rubber Tired Dozers | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 8.0 | 367 | 0.40 |
| Site Preparation | Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes | Diesel | Average | 4.0 | 8.0 | 84 | 0.37 |
| Grading | Graders | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 148 | 0.41 |
| Grading | Excavators | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 36 | 0.38 |
| Grading | Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 84 | 0.37 |
| Grading | Scrapers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 423 | 0.48 |
| Grading | Rubber Tired Dozers | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 367 | 0.40 |
| Building Construction | Forklifts | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 8.0 | 82 | 0.20 |
| Building Construction | Generator Sets | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 14 | 0.74 |
| Building Construction | Cranes | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 7.0 | 367 | 0.29 |
| Building Construction | Welders | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 46 | 0.45 |
| Building Construction | Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 7.0 | 84 | 0.37 |
| Paving | Pavers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 81 | 0.42 |
| Paving | Paving Equipment | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 89 | 0.36 |
| Paving | Rollers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 36 | 0.38 |
| Architectural Coating | Air Compressors | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 6.0 | 37 | 0.48 |

## 5.3. Construction Vehicles

### 5.3.1. Unmitigated

| Phase Name | Trip Type | One-Way Trips per Day | Miles per Trip | Vehicle Mix |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | Worker | 15 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Demolition | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Demolition | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Demolition | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Site Preparation | Worker | 18 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site Preparation | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Site Preparation | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Site Preparation | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Grading | Worker | 20 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Grading | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Grading | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Grading | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Building Construction | Worker | 2,880 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Building Construction | Vendor | 428 | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Building Construction | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Building Construction | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Paving | Worker | 15 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Paving | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Paving | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Paving | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Architectural Coating | Worker | 576 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Architectural Coating | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Architectural Coating | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Architectural Coating | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |

## 5.4. Vehicles

### 5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

## 5.5. Architectural Coatings

| Phase Name | Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Parking Area Coated (sq ft) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architectural Coating | 7,776,000 | 2,592,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — |

## 5.6. Dust Mitigation

### 5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

| Phase Name | Material Imported (cy) | Material Exported (cy) | Acres Graded (acres) | Material Demolished (sq. ft.) | Acres Paved (acres) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 |
| Site Preparation | — | — | 90 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Grading | — | — | 465 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

### 5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

## 5.7. Construction Paving

| Phase Name | Land Use | Area Paved (acres) | % Asphalt |
|---|---|---|---|
| Paving | Apartments Mid Rise | — | 0% |
| Paving | Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | 0% |

## 5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

### kWh per Year and Emission Factor (lb/MWh)

| Year | kWh per Year | CO2 | CH4 | N2O |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2026 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2027 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2028 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2029 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2030 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2031 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2032 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2033 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2034 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |

## 5.9. Operational Mobile Sources

### 5.9.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use Type | Trips/Weekday | Trips/Saturday | Trips/Sunday | Trips/Year | VMT/Weekday | VMT/Saturday | VMT/Sunday | VMT/Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 10,880 | 9,820 | 8,180 | 3,775,143 | 57,891 | 52,251 | 43,525 | 20,087,074 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 10,880 | 9,820 | 8,180 | 3,775,143 | 57,891 | 52,251 | 43,525 | 20,087,074 |

## 5.10. Operational Area Sources

### 5.10.1. Hearths

| Land Use | Hearth Type | Unmitigated (number) | Mitigated (number) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | Wood Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Gas Fireplaces | 1,020 | 1,020 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Propane Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Electric Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | No Fireplaces | 980 | 980 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Conventional Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Non-Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Pellet Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Wood Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Gas Fireplaces | 1,020 | 1,020 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Propane Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Electric Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | No Fireplaces | 980 | 980 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Conventional Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Non-Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Pellet Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |

### 5.10.2. Architectural Coatings

| — | Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Parking Area Coated (sq ft) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| undefined | 7,776,000 | 2,592,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — |

### 5.10.3. Landscape Equipment

| Season | Unit | Value |
|---|---|---|
| Snow Days | day/yr | 0.00 |
| Summer Days | day/yr | 180 |

## 5.11. Operational Energy Consumption

### 5.11.1. Unmitigated

Electricity (kWh/yr) and CO2 and CH4 and N2O and Natural Gas (kBTU/yr)

| Land Use | Electricity (kWh/yr) | CO2 | CH4 | N2O | Natural Gas (kBTU/yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 6,822,902 | 204 | 0.0330 | 0.0040 | 17,608,142 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 6,822,902 | 204 | 0.0330 | 0.0040 | 17,608,142 |

## 5.12. Operational Water and Wastewater Consumption

### 5.12.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use | Indoor Water (gal/year) | Outdoor Water (gal/year) |
|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 58,681,050 | 0.00 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 58,681,050 | 0.00 |

## 5.13. Operational Waste Generation

### 5.13.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use | Waste (ton/year) | Cogeneration (kWh/year) |
|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 1,479 | 0.00 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 1,479 | 0.00 |

## 5.14. Operational Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment

### 5.14.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use | Equipment Type | Refrigerant | GWP | Quantity (kg) | Operations Leak Rate | Service Leak Rate | Times Serviced |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | Average room A/C & Other residential A/C and heat pumps | R-410A | 2,088 | < 0.005 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 10.0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Household refrigerators and/or freezers | R-134a | 1,430 | 0.12 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Average room A/C & Other residential A/C and heat pumps | R-410A | 2,088 | < 0.005 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 10.0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Household refrigerators and/or freezers | R-134a | 1,430 | 0.12 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

## 5.15. Operational Off-Road Equipment

### 5.15.1. Unmitigated

## 5.16. Stationary Sources

### 5.16.1. Emergency Generators and Fire Pumps

### 5.16.2. Process Boilers

## 5.17. User Defined

## 5.18. Vegetation

### 5.18.1. Land Use Change

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

| Vegetation Land Use Type | Vegetation Soil Type | Initial Acres | Final Acres |
|---|---|---|---|

### 5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

| Biomass Cover Type | Initial Acres | Final Acres |
|---|---|---|

### 5.18.2. Sequestration

#### 5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

| Tree Type | Number | Electricity Saved (kWh/year) | Natural Gas Saved (btu/year) |
|---|---|---|---|

# 6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

## 6.1. Climate Risk Summary

Cal-Adapt midcentury 2040–2059 average projections for four hazards are reported below for your project location. These are under Representation Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 which assumes GHG emissions will continue to rise strongly through 2050 and then plateau around 2100.

| Climate Hazard | Result for Project Location | Unit |
|---|---|---|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | 5.9 | annual days of extreme heat |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extreme Precipitation | 7.5 | annual days with precipitation above 20 mm |
| Sea Level Rise | — | meters of inundation depth |
| Wildfire | 4.4 | annual hectares burned |

Temperature and Extreme Heat data are for grid cell in which your project are located. The projection is based on the 98th historical percentile of daily maximum/minimum temperatures from observed historical data (32 climate model ensemble from Cal-Adapt, 2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.
Extreme Precipitation data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The threshold of 20 mm is equivalent to about ¾ an inch of rain, which would be light to moderate rainfall if received over a full day or heavy rain if received over a period of 2 to 4 hours. Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.
Sea Level Rise data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from Radke et al. (2017), as reported in Cal-Adapt (Radke et al., 2017, CEC-500-2017-008), and consider inundation location and depth for the San Francisco Bay, the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and California coast resulting different increments of sea level rise coupled with extreme storm events. Users may select from four scenarios to view the range in potential inundation depth for the grid cell. The four scenarios are: No rise, 0.5 meter, 1.0 meter, 1.41 meters
Wildfire data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from UC Davis, as reported in Cal-Adapt (2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5), and consider historical data of climate, vegetation, population density, and large (> 400 ha) fire history. Users may select from four model simulations to view the range in potential wildfire probabilities for the grid cell. The four simulations make different assumptions about expected rainfall and temperature are: Warmer/drier (HadGEM2-ES), Cooler/wetter (CNRM-CM5), Average conditions (CanESM2), Range of different rainfall and temperature possibilities (MIROC5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

## 6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

| Climate Hazard | Exposure Score | Sensitivity Score | Adaptive Capacity Score | Vulnerability Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Extreme Precipitation | 2 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Sea Level Rise | 1 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Wildfire | 1 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Flooding | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Drought | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Snowpack Reduction | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Air Quality Degradation | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.
The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.
The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores do not include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

## 6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

| Climate Hazard | Exposure Score | Sensitivity Score | Adaptive Capacity Score | Vulnerability Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Extreme Precipitation | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Sea Level Rise | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Wildfire | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Flooding | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Drought | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Snowpack Reduction | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Air Quality Degradation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.
The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.
The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

## 6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

# 7. Health and Equity Details

## 7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

| Indicator | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---|
| Exposure Indicators | — |
| AQ-Ozone | 3.1 |
| AQ-PM | 25 |
| AQ-DPM | 99 |
| Drinking Water | 15 |
| Lead Risk Housing | 59 |
| Pesticides | 9.0 |
| Toxic Releases | 45 |
| Traffic | 53 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Effect Indicators | — |
| CleanUp Sites | 74 |
| Groundwater | 71 |
| Haz Waste Facilities/Generators | 98 |
| Impaired Water Bodies | 0.00 |
| Solid Waste | 80 |
| Sensitive Population | — |
| Asthma | 81 |
| Cardio-vascular | 18 |
| Low Birth Weights | 84 |
| Socioeconomic Factor Indicators | — |
| Education | 48 |
| Housing | 67 |
| Linguistic | 82 |
| Poverty | 65 |
| Unemployment | 54 |

## 7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

| Indicator | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---|
| Economic | — |
| Above Poverty | 21.28833569 |
| Employed | 26.07468241 |
| Median HI | 16.37366868 |
| Education | — |
| Bachelor's or higher | 64.48094444 |
| High school enrollment | 100 |
| Preschool enrollment | 38.90671115 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Transportation | — |
| Auto Access | 0.372128834 |
| Active commuting | 99.53804697 |
| Social | — |
| 2-parent households | 2.643397921 |
| Voting | 31.75927114 |
| Neighborhood | — |
| Alcohol availability | 4.516874118 |
| Park access | 38.62440652 |
| Retail density | 99.05042987 |
| Supermarket access | 94.25125112 |
| Tree canopy | 6.03105351 |
| Housing | — |
| Homeownership | 10.15013474 |
| Housing habitability | 0.526113178 |
| Low-inc homeowner severe housing cost burden | 32.54202489 |
| Low-inc renter severe housing cost burden | 44.3731554 |
| Uncrowded housing | 36.46862569 |
| Health Outcomes | — |
| Insured adults | 41.04965995 |
| Arthritis | 59.3 |
| Asthma ER Admissions | 18.9 |
| High Blood Pressure | 44.4 |
| Cancer (excluding skin) | 68.9 |
| Asthma | 37.3 |
| Coronary Heart Disease | 43.7 |
| Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease | 33.2 |
| Diagnosed Diabetes | 36.9 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Life Expectancy at Birth | 23.5 |
| Cognitively Disabled | 4.4 |
| Physically  Disabled | 1.7 |
| Heart Attack ER Admissions | 60.2 |
| Mental Health Not Good | 34.8 |
| Chronic Kidney Disease | 35.4 |
| Obesity | 39.8 |
| Pedestrian Injuries | 98.0 |
| Physical Health Not Good | 33.1 |
| Stroke | 34.3 |
| Health Risk Behaviors | — |
| Binge Drinking | 24.0 |
| Current Smoker | 20.2 |
| No Leisure Time for Physical Activity | 36.8 |
| Climate Change Exposures | — |
| Wildfire Risk | 0.0 |
| SLR Inundation Area | 0.0 |
| Children | 86.0 |
| Elderly | 54.5 |
| English Speaking | 11.2 |
| Foreign-born | 81.4 |
| Outdoor Workers | 88.7 |
| Climate Change Adaptive Capacity | — |
| Impervious Surface Cover | 0.2 |
| Traffic Density | 58.5 |
| Traffic Access | 87.4 |
| Other Indices | — |
| Hardship | 58.6 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other Decision Support | — |
| 2016 Voting | 44.8 |

## 7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

| Metric | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---|
| CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score for Project Location (a) | 71 |
| Healthy Places Index Score for Project Location (b) | 20 |
| Project Located in a Designated Disadvantaged Community (Senate Bill 535) | No |
| Project Located in a Low-Income Community (Assembly Bill 1550) | Yes |
| Project Located in a Community Air Protection Program Community (Assembly Bill 617) | No |

a: The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.
b: The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

## 7.4. Health & Equity Measures

No Health & Equity Measures selected.

## 7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

Health & Equity Evaluation Scorecard not completed.

## 7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

No Health & Equity Custom Measures created.

# 8. User Changes to Default Data

## 8.1. Justifications

| Screen | Justification |
|---|---|
| Operations: Water and Waste Water | Outdoor water use set to zero. |

SWAPE Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

## Matthew F. Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.

- **Geologic and Hydrogeologic Characterization, Investigation and Remediation Strategies**
- **Industrial Stormwater Compliance**
- **CEQA Review**
- **Expert Testimony**

**Professional Certifications:**
California Professional Geologist, P.G.
California Certified Hydrogeologist, C.Hg.

**Education:**
M.S. Degree, Geology, California State University Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 1984.
B.A. Degree, Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA, 1982.

**Professional Experience:**
30 years of experience in environmental policy, contaminant assessment and remediation, stormwater compliance, and CEQA review. Spent nine years with the U.S. EPA in the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) and Superfund programs and served as EPA's Senior Science Policy Advisor in the Western Regional Office where I identified emerging threats to groundwater. While with EPA, I served as a Senior Hydrogeologist in the oversight of the assessment of seven major military facilities undergoing base closure. Led numerous enforcement actions under provisions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and directed efforts to improve hydrogeologic characterization and water quality monitoring. For the past 15 years, as a founding partner with SWAPE, I developed extensive client relationships and has managed complex projects that include consultations as an expert witness and a regulatory specialist, and managing projects ranging from industrial stormwater compliance to CEQA review of impacts from hazardous waste, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Positions held include:

Government:
Senior Science Policy Advisor and Hydrogeologist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1989–1998);

Hydrogeologist, National Park Service, Water Resources Division (1998 – 2000);
Geologist, U.S. Forest Service (1986 – 1998).

Educational:
Geology Instructor, Golden West College, 2010 – 2104, 2017;
Adjunct Faculty Member, San Francisco State University, Department of Geosciences (1993 – 1998);
Instructor, College of Marin, Department of Science (1990 – 1995).

Private Sector:
Founding Partner, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) (2003 – present);
Senior Environmental Analyst, Komex H2O Science, Inc. (2000 -- 2003);
Executive Director, Orange Coast Watch (2001 – 2004);
Geologist, Dames & Moore (1984 – 1986).

**Senior Regulatory and Litigation Support Analyst:**
With SWAPE, responsibilities have included:

- Lead analyst and testifying expert, for both plaintiffs and defendants, in the review of over 300 environmental impact reports and negative declarations since 2003 under CEQA that identify significant issues with regard to hazardous waste, water resources, water quality, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and geologic hazards.
- Recommending additional mitigation measures to lead agencies at the local and county level to include additional characterization of health risks and implementation of protective measures to reduce exposure to hazards from toxins.
- Stormwater analysis, sampling and best management practice evaluation, for both government agencies and corporate clients, at more than 150 industrial facilities.
- Serving as expert witness for both plaintiffs and defendants in cases including contamination of groundwater, CERCLAcompliance in assessment and remediation, and industrial stormwater contamination.
- Technical assistance and litigation support for vapor intrusion concerns, for both government agencies and corporate clients.
- Lead analyst and testifying expert in the review of environmental issues in license applicationsfor large solar power plants before the California Energy Commission.
- Manager of a project to evaluate numerous formerly used military sites in the western U.S.
- Manager of a comprehensive evaluation of potential sources of perchlorate contamination in Southern California drinking water wells.
- Manager and designated expert for litigation support under provisions of Proposition 65 in the review of releases of gasoline to sources drinking water at major refineries and hundreds of gas stations throughout California.

With Komex H2O Science Inc., duties included the following:

- Senior author of a report on the extent of perchlorate contamination that was used in testimony by the former U.S. EPA Administrator and General Counsel.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of MTBE use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of perchlorate use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in a study that estimates nationwide costs for MTBE remediation and drinking

water treatment, results of which were published in newspapers nationwide and in testimony against provisions of an energy bill that would limit liability for oil companies.

- Research to support litigation to restore drinking water supplies that have been contaminated by MTBE in California and New York.
- Lead author for a multi-volume remedial investigation report for an operating school in LosAngeles that met strict Sate of California regulatory requirements.
- Development of strategic approaches for cleanup of contaminated sites in consultation withclients and regulators.

**Hydrogeology:**

As a Senior Hydrogeologist with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, led investigations to characterize and cleanup closing military bases, including Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, Treasure Island Naval Station, Alameda Naval Station, Moffett Field, Mather Army Airfield, and Sacramento Army Depot. Specific activities included:

- Leading efforts to model groundwater flow and contaminant transport, ensured adequacy of monitoring networks, and assessed cleanup alternatives for contaminated sediment, soil, and groundwater.
- Initiating a regional program for evaluation of groundwater sampling practices and laboratory analysis at military bases.
- Identifying emerging issues, wrote technical guidance, and assisted in policy and regulation development through work on four national U.S. EPA workgroups, including the Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum and the Federal Facilities Forum.

At the request of the State of Hawaii, developed a methodology to determine the vulnerability of groundwater to contamination on the islands of Maui and Oahu. Used analytical models and a GIS to show zones of vulnerability, and the results were adopted and published by the State of Hawaii and County of Maui.

As a hydrogeologist with the EPA Groundwater Protection Section, worked with provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act and NEPA to prevent drinking water contamination. Specific activities included the following:

- Received an EPA Bronze Medal for contribution to the development of national guidance for the protection of drinking water.
- Managed the Sole Source Aquifer Program and protected the drinking water of two communities through designation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Prepared geologic reports, conducted hearings, and responded to public comments from residents who were very concerned about the impact of designation.
- Reviewed a number of Environmental Impact Statements for planned major developments, including large hazardous and solid waste disposal facilities, mine reclamation, and water transfer.

Served as a hydrogeologist with the RCRA Hazardous Waste program. Duties included:

- Supervised the hydrogeologic investigation of hazardous waste sites to determine compliancewith Subtitle C requirements.
- Reviewed and wrote "part B" permits for the disposal of hazardous waste.
- Conducted RCRA Corrective Action investigations of waste sites and led inspections that formed the basis for significant enforcement actions that were developed in close coordination with U.S.EPA legal counsel.

- Wrote contract specifications and supervised contractor's investigations of waste sites.

With the National Park Service, directed service-wide investigations of contaminant sources to prevent degradation of water quality, including the following:

- Applied pertinent laws and regulations including CERCLA, RCRA, NEPA, NRDA, and the Clean Water Act to control military, mining, and landfill contaminants.
- Conducted watershed-scale investigations of contaminants at parks, including Yellowstone and Olympic National Park.
- Identified high-levels of perchlorate in soil adjacent to a national park in New Mexicoand advised park superintendent on appropriate response actions under CERCLA.
- Served as a Park Service representative on the Interagency Perchlorate Steering Committee, a national workgroup.
- Developed a program to conduct environmental compliance audits of all National Parks while serving on a national workgroup.
- Co-authored two papers on the potential for water contamination from the operation of personal watercraft and snowmobiles, these papers serving as the basis for the development of nation- wide policy on the use of these vehicles in National Parks.
- Contributed to the Federal Multi-Agency Source Water Agreement under the Clean Water Action Plan.

**Policy:**

Served as senior management as the Senior Science Policy Advisor with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9. Activities included the following:

- Advising the Regional Administrator and senior management on emerging issues such as the potential for the gasoline additive MTBE and ammonium perchlorate to contaminate drinkingwater supplies.
- Shaping EPA's national response to these threats by serving on workgroups and by contributingto guidance, including the Office of Research and Development publication, Oxygenates in Water: Critical Information and Research Needs.
- Improving the technical training of EPA's scientific and engineering staff.
- Earning an EPA Bronze Medal for representing the region's 300 scientists and engineers in negotiations with the Administrator and senior management to better integrate scientific principles into the policy-making process.
- Establishing national protocol for the peer review of scientific documents.

**Geology:**

With the U.S. Forest Service, led investigations to determine hillslope stability of areas proposed for timber harvest in the central Oregon Coast Range. Specific activities included:

- Mapping geology in the field, and used aerial photographic interpretation and mathematical models to determine slope stability.
- Coordinating research with community stakeholders who were concerned with natural resource protection.
- Characterizing the geology of an aquifer that serves as the sole source of drinking water for thecity of Medford, Oregon.

As a consultant with Dames and Moore, led geologic investigations of two contaminated sites (later listed on the Superfund NPL) in the Portland, Oregon, area and a large RCRA hazardous waste site in eastern Oregon.

Duties included the following:

- Supervising year-long effort for soil and groundwater sampling.
- Conducting aquifer tests.
- Investigating active faults beneath sites proposed for hazardous waste disposal.

**Teaching:**

From 1990 to 1998, taught at least one course per semester at the community college and university levels:

- At San Francisco State University, held an adjunct faculty position and taught courses in environmental geology, oceanography (lab and lecture), hydrogeology, and groundwater contamination.
- Served as a committee member for graduate and undergraduate students.
- Taught courses in environmental geology and oceanography at the College of Marin.
- Part time geology instructor at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California from 2010 to 2014 and in 2017.

***Summary of Testimony Experience Over Past Four Years***

*In Re New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection et al. vs. E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company, in the United States District Court, District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-14766-RMB-JBC. Deposition in 2025. Representing Plaintiffs in matters regarding contamination of groundwater, wastewater, soil, and air with per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances.*

*In Re Edmond Asher, et al., vs. RTX Corporation (f/k/a Raytheon Technologies Corporation, et al.) in the County of Huntington Superior Court, Indiana, Cause number 35D01-2006-CT-000338. Deposition in 2024. Representing Plaintiffs in matters regarding contamination of groundwater and soil vapor with trichlorethylene.*

*In Re Wright vs Consolidated Rail Corporation In the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Case No: 21L3966. Deposition in 2023, Representing Plaintiff in matters involving groundwater and drinking water contamination of perchloroethylene, trichlorethylene, 1,2-dichloroethane, and carbon tetrachloride.*

*In Re Behr Dayton Thermal Products LLC In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division at Dayton, Case No: 08-cv-326. Deposition in 2022. Representing Plaintiff in matters regarding contamination of groundwater and indoor air with perchloroethylene and trichloethelene.*

*Orange County Water District vs. Sabic Innovative Plastics US, LLC, et al. In the Court of Appeal, Fourth District,*

*Division 1, California, Case No: D070553. Deposition in 2020. Representing Plaintiff in matters involving compliance with The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).*
*Los Angeles Waterkeeper vs. AAA Plating and Inspection, Inc. In the United States District Court for the Central District of California, Case No: No. CV 18-5916 PA (GJSx). Deposition in 2019. Expert witness representing Plaintiff in matters involving contaminated stormwater runoff at an industrial facility in Compton, California.*

*Californians for Alternatives to Toxics vs. Schneider Dock and Intermodal Facility. In the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Case No: 3:17-cv-05287-JST. Deposition in 2019. Expert witness representing Plaintiff in matters involving contaminated stormwater runoff at an industrial facility in Eureka, California.*

*Bells et al. vs. The 3M Company et al. In the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, Case No: 1:16-CV-02531-RBJ. Deposition in 2018. Expert witness representing Plaintiff on matters regarding the general hydrogeological conditions present in an area impacted by per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances.*

*Ungar vs. Foundation for Affordable Housing. In the Superior Court, State of California, Los Angeles County, Case No. BC628890 Deposition in 2017. Expert witness representing defendant on matters involving alleged drinking water contamination.*

**Invited Testimony, Reports, Papers and Presentations:**

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Presentation to the Public Environmental Law Conference, Eugene, Oregon.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Invited presentation to U.S.EPA Region 9, San Francisco, California.

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2005. Use of Electronic Databases in Environmental Regulation, Policy Making andPublic Participation. Brownfields 2005, Denver, Coloradao.

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in Nevada and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Las Vegas, NV (served on conference organizing committee).

**Hagemann, M.F.**, 2004. Invited testimony to a California Senate committee hearing on air toxins atschools in Southern California, Los Angeles.

Brown, A., Farrow, J., Gray, A. and **Hagemann, M.**, 2004. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBEReleases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells.

Presentation to the Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference, National GroundwaterAssociation.

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Waterin Arizona and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Phoenix, AZ (served on conference organizing committee).

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Waterin the Southwestern U.S. Invited presentation to a special committee meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, Irvine, CA.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to atribal EPA meeting, Pechanga, CA.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to ameeting of tribal representatives, Parker, AZ.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Impact of Perchlorate on the Colorado River and Associated Drinking WaterSupplies. Invited presentation to the Inter-Tribal Meeting, Torres Martinez Tribe.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. The Emergence of Perchlorate as a Widespread Drinking Water Contaminant.Invited presentation to the U.S. EPA Region 9.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. A Deductive Approach to the Assessment of Perchlorate Contamination. Invited presentation to the California Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Perchlorate: A Cold War Legacy in Drinking Water. Presentation to a meeting ofthe National Groundwater Association.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Presentation to ameeting of the National Groundwater Association.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater and an Estimate of Costs to AddressImpacts to Groundwater. Presentation to the annual meeting of the Society of Environmental Journalists.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. An Estimate of the Cost to Address MTBE Contamination in Groundwater(and Who Will Pay). Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells. Presentation to a meeting of the U.S. EPA andState Underground Storage Tank Program managers.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2001. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Unpublishedreport.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2001. Estimated Cleanup Cost for MTBE in Groundwater Used as Drinking Water. Unpublished report.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2001. Estimated Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Leaking Underground StorageTanks.

Unpublished report.

**Hagemann, M.F**., and VanMouwerik, M., 1999. Potential Water Concerns Related to Snowmobile Usage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

VanMouwerik, M. and **Hagemann, M.F**. 1999, Water Quality Concerns Related to Personal WatercraftUsage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1999, Is Dilution the Solution to Pollution in National Parks? The George WrightSociety Biannual Meeting, Asheville, North Carolina.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1997, The Potential for MTBE to Contaminate Groundwater. U.S. EPA Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada.

**Hagemann, M.F**., and Gill, M., 1996, Impediments to Intrinsic Remediation, Moffett Field Naval AirStation, Conference on Intrinsic Remediation of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, Salt Lake City.

**Hagemann, M.F**., Fukunaga, G.L., 1996, The Vulnerability of Groundwater to Anthropogenic Contaminants on the Island of Maui, Hawaii. Hawaii Water Works Association Annual Meeting, Maui,October 1996.

**Hagemann, M. F**., Fukanaga, G. L., 1996, Ranking Groundwater Vulnerability in Central Oahu, Hawaii. Proceedings, Geographic Information Systems in Environmental Resources Management, Airand Waste Management Association Publication VIP-61.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1994. Groundwater Characterization and Cleanup at Closing Military Basesin California. Proceedings, California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

**Hagemann, M.**F. and Sabol, M.A., 1993. Role of the U.S. EPA in the High Plains States Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program. Proceedings, Sixth Biennial Symposium on the Artificial Recharge of Groundwater.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1993. U.S. EPA Policy on the Technical Impracticability of the Cleanup of DNAPL-contaminated Groundwater. California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1992. Dense Nonaqueous Phase Liquid Contamination of Groundwater: An Ounce of Prevention... Proceedings, Association of Engineering Geologists Annual Meeting, v. 35.

Other Experience:
Selected as subject matter expert for the California Professional Geologist licensing examinations,2009-2011.

---

SWAPE Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

**SOIL WATER AIR PROTECTION ENTERPRISE**
2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, California 90405
Attn: Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.
Mobil: (310) 795-2335
Office: (310) 452-5555
Fax: (310) 452-5550
**Email:** prosenfeld@swape.com

# *Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.*

**Chemical Fate and Transport & Air Dispersion Modeling**

*Principal Environmental Chemist*

**Risk Assessment & Remediation Specialist**

## Education

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on volatile organic compound filtration.

M.S. Environmental Science, U.C. Berkeley, 1995. Thesis on organic waste economics.

B.A. Environmental Studies, U.C. Santa Barbara, 1991. Focus on wastewater treatment.

## Professional Experience

Dr. Rosenfeld has over 25 years of experience conducting environmental investigations and risk assessments for evaluating impacts to human health, property, and ecological receptors. His expertise focuses on the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, human health risk, exposure assessment, and ecological restoration. Dr. Rosenfeld has evaluated and modeled emissions from oil spills, landfills, boilers and incinerators, process stacks, storage tanks, confined animal feeding operations, industrial, military and agricultural sources, unconventional oil drilling operations, and locomotive and construction engines. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources to evaluating impacts of pollution on workers at industrial facilities and residents in surrounding communities. Dr. Rosenfeld has also successfully modeled exposure to contaminants distributed by water systems and via vapor intrusion.

Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing lead, heavy metals, mold, bacteria, particulate matter, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, dioxins and furans, semi- and volatile organic compounds, PCBs, PAHs, creosote, perchlorate, asbestos, per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFOA/PFOS), unusual polymers, fuel oxygenates (MTBE), among other pollutants. Dr. Rosenfeld also has experience evaluating greenhouse gas emissions from various projects and is an expert on the assessment of odors from industrial and agricultural sites, as well as the evaluation of odor nuisance impacts and technologies for abatement of odorous emissions. As a principal scientist at SWAPE, Dr. Rosenfeld directs air dispersion modeling and exposure assessments. He has served as an expert witness and testified about pollution sources causing nuisance and/or personal injury at sites and has testified as an expert witness on numerous cases involving exposure to soil, water and air contaminants from industrial, railroad, agricultural, and military sources.

## Professional History:

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Principal and Founding Partner
UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2011; Lecturer (Assistant Researcher)
UCLA School of Public Health; 2003 to 2006; Adjunct Professor
UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering Program; 2002-2004; Doctoral Intern Coordinator
UCLA Institute of the Environment, 2001-2002; Research Associate
Komex $H_2O$ Science, 2001 to 2003; Senior Remediation Scientist
National Groundwater Association, 2002-2004; Lecturer
San Diego State University, 1999-2001; Adjunct Professor
Anteon Corp., San Diego, 2000-2001; Remediation Project Manager
Ogden (now Amec), San Diego, 2000-2000; Remediation Project Manager
Bechtel, San Diego, California, 1999 – 2000; Risk Assessor
King County, Seattle, 1996 – 1999; Scientist
James River Corp., Washington, 1995-96; Scientist
Big Creek Lumber, Davenport, California, 1995; Scientist
Plumas Corp., California and USFS, Tahoe 1993-1995; Scientist
Peace Corps and World Wildlife Fund, St. Kitts, West Indies, 1991-1993; Scientist

## Publications:

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., Spaeth, K.R., McCarthy, S.J. *et al.* Camp Lejeune Marine Cancer Risk Assessment for Exposure to Contaminated Drinking Water From 1955 to 1987. *Water Air Soil Pollut* **235**, 124 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-023-06863-y.

**Rosenfeld P.E.,** Spaeth K.R., Remy L.L., Byers V., Muerth S.A., Hallman R,C., Summers-Evans J., Barker S. (2023) Perfluoroalkyl substances exposure in firefighters: Sources and implications, *Environmental Research*, Volume 220, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.115164.

**Rosenfeld P.E.** and Spaeth K.R., (2023) Authors' Response to Letter to the Editor from Bullock and Ramacciotti, *Water Air Soil Pollution* Volume 234, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-023-06165-3

**Rosenfeld P. E.,** Spaeth K., Hallman R., Bressler R., Smith, G., (2022) Cancer Risk and Diesel Exhaust Exposure Among Railroad Workers. *Water Air Soil Pollution.* **233,** 171.

Remy, L.L., Clay T., Byers, V., **Rosenfeld P. E.** (2019) Hospital, Health, and Community Burden After Oil Refinery Fires, Richmond, California 2007 and 2012. *Environmental Health.* 18:48

Simons, R.A., Seo, Y. **Rosenfeld, P**., (2015) Modeling the Effect of Refinery Emission On Residential Property Value. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 27(3):321-342

Chen, J. A, Zapata A. R., Sutherland A. J., Molmen, D.R., Chow, B. S., Wu, L. E., **Rosenfeld, P. E.,** Hesse, R. C., (2012) Sulfur Dioxide and Volatile Organic Compound Exposure To A Community In Texas City Texas Evaluated Using Aermod and Empirical Data. *American Journal of Environmental Science*, 8(6), 622-632.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. & Feng, L. (2011). *The Risks of Hazardous Waste.* Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2011). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Gonzalez, J., Feng, L., Sutherland, A., Waller, C., Sok, H., Hesse, R., **Rosenfeld, P.** (2010). PCBs and Dioxins/Furans in Attic Dust Collected Near Former PCB Production and Secondary Copper Facilities in Sauget, IL. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*. 113–125.

Feng, L., Wu, C., Tam, L., Sutherland, A.J., Clark, J.J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). Dioxin and Furan Blood Lipid and Attic Dust Concentrations in Populations Living Near Four Wood Treatment Facilities in the United States. *Journal of Environmental Health*. 73(6), 34-46.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Wood and Paper Industries.* Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.,** (2009). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Petroleum Industry*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P**. (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Air Pollution,* 123 (17), 319-327.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** Davletshin, A.R. (2008). ***Responsible Care***. Gulf Publishing. Texas.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). A Statistical Analysis Of Attic Dust And Blood Lipid Concentrations Of Tetrachloro-p-Dibenzodioxin (TCDD) Toxicity Equivalency Quotients (TEQ) In Two Populations Near Wood Treatment Facilities. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 002252-002255.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). Methods For Collect Samples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In Attic Dust: A Review. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 000527-000530.

Hensley, A.R. A. Scott, J. J. J. Clark, **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2007). Attic Dust and Human Blood Samples Collected near a Former Wood Treatment Facility. *Environmental Research*. 105, 194-197.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** J. J. J. Clark, A. R. Hensley, M. Suffet. (2007). The Use of an Odor Wheel Classification for Evaluation of Human Health Risk Criteria for Compost Facilities. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 345-357.

**Rosenfeld, P. E., M.** Suffet. (2007). The Anatomy of Odour Wheels for Odours of Drinking Water, Wastewater, Compost And The Urban Environment. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 335-344.

Sullivan, P. J. Clark, J.J.J., Agardy, F. J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2007). *Toxic Legacy, Synthetic Toxins in the Food, Water, and Air in American Cities.* Boston Massachusetts: Elsevier Publishing

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9),171-178.

**Rosenfeld P. E.,** J.J. Clark, I.H. (Mel) Suffet (2004). The Value of An Odor-Quality-Wheel Classification Scheme for The Urban Environment. *Water Environment Federation's Technical Exhibition and Conference (WEFTEC) 2004.* New Orleans, October 2-6, 2004.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Suffet, I.H. (2004). Understanding Odorants Associated with Compost, Biomass Facilities, and the Land Application of Biosolids. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9), 193-199.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash, *Water Science and Technology*, 49(9), 171-178.

**Rosenfeld, P. E**., Grey, M. A., Sellew, P. (2004). Measurement of Biosolids Odor and Odorant Emissions from Windrows, Static Pile and Biofilter. *Water Environment Research*. 76(4), 310-315.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** Grey, M and Suffet, M. (2002). Compost Demonstration Project, Sacramento California Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Integrated Waste Management Board Public Affairs Office*, Publications Clearinghouse (MS–6), Sacramento, CA Publication #442-02-008.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., and C.L. Henry. (2001). Characterization of odor emissions from three different biosolids. *Water Soil and Air Pollution*. 127(1-4), 173-191.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Henry C. L., (2000). Wood ash control of odor emissions from biosolids application. *Journal of Environmental Quality.* 29, 1662-1668.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** C.L. Henry and D. Bennett. (2001). Wastewater dewatering polymer affects on biosolids odor emissions and microbial activity. *Water Environment Research*. 73(4), 363-367.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and C.L. Henry. (2001). Activated Carbon and Wood Ash Sorption of Wastewater, Compost, and Biosolids Odorants. *Water Environment Research*, 73, 388-393.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Henry C. L., (2001). High carbon wood ash effect on biosolids microbial activity and odor. *Water Environment Research*. 131(1-4), 247-262.

Chollack, T. and **P. Rosenfeld. (**1998). Compost Amendment Handbook for Landscaping. Prepared for and distributed by the City of Redmond, Washington State.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1992). The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. *Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts*, 3(2).

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1993). High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation on St. Kitts. *Biomass Users Network*, 7(1).

**Rosenfeld, P. E. (**1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Doctoral Thesis. University of Washington College of Forest Resources.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1994). Potential Utilization of Small Diameter Trees on Sierra County Public Land. Master's thesis reprinted by the Sierra County Economic Council. Sierra County, California.

**Rosenfeld, P. E. (**1991). How to Build a Small Rural Anaerobic Digester & Uses Of Biogas In The First And Third World. Bachelor's Thesis. University of California.

## Presentations:

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., "The science for Perfluorinated Chemicals (PFAS): What makes remediation so hard?" Law Seminars International, (May 9-10, 2018) 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 101 Seattle, WA.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** Sutherland, A; Hesse, R.; Zapata, A. (October 3-6, 2013). Air dispersion modeling of volatile organic emissions from multiple natural gas wells in Decatur, TX. *44th Western Regional Meeting, American Chemical Society.* Lecture conducted from Santa Clara, CA.

Sok, H.L.; Waller, C.C.; Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sutherland, A.J.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Atrazine: A Persistent Pesticide in Urban Drinking Water. *Urban Environmental Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sok, H.L.; Sutherland, A.J.; Waller, C.C.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; La, M.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Bringing Environmental Justice to East St. Louis, Illinois. *Urban Environmental Pollution.* Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. (April 19-23, 2009). Perfluoroctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluoroactane Sulfonate (PFOS) Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*, Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** (April 19-23, 2009). Cost to Filter Atrazine Contamination from Drinking Water in the United States" Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*. Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P**. (20-22 July (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. Brebbia, C.A. and Popov, V., eds., *Air Pollution XVII: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Modeling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Tallinn, Estonia.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). Moss Point Community Exposure To Contaminants From A Releasing Facility. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water.* Platform lecture conducted at University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). The Repeated Trespass of Tritium-Contaminated Water Into A Surrounding Community Form Repeated Waste Spills From A Nuclear Power Plant. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). Somerville Community Exposure To Contaminants From Wood Treatment Facility Emissions. The *23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld P. E.** (March 2007). Production, Chemical Properties, Toxicology, & Treatment Case Studies of 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (TCP). *The Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) Annual Meeting*. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

**Rosenfeld P. E.** (March 2007). Blood and Attic Sampling for Dioxin/Furan, PAH, and Metal Exposure in Florala, Alabama. *The AEHS Annual Meeting.* Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.,** Clark, J.J.J. (August 21 – 25, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *The 26th International Symposium on Halogenated Persistent Organic Pollutants – DIOXIN2006*. Lecture conducted from Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.,** Clark, J.J.J. (November 4-8, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *APHA 134 Annual Meeting & Exposition.* Lecture conducted from Boston Massachusetts.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (October 24-25, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. Mealey's C8/PFOA. *Science, Risk & Litigation Conference.* Lecture conducted from The Rittenhouse Hotel, Philadelphia, PA.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 19, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, *Toxicology and Remediation PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference*. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel, Irvine California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 19, 2005). Fate, Transport, Toxicity, And Persistence of 1,2,3-TCP. *PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference.* Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel in Irvine, California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 26-27, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PDBEs. *Mealey's Groundwater Conference.* Lecture conducted from Ritz Carlton Hotel, Marina Del Ray, California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (June 7-8, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. *International Society of Environmental Forensics: Focus on Emerging Contaminants*. Lecture conducted from Sheraton Oceanfront Hotel, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (July 21-22, 2005). Fate Transport, Persistence and Toxicology of PFOA and Related Perfluorochemicals. *2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (July 21-22, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology and Remediation. *2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference.* Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and James Clark Ph.D. and Rob Hesse R.G. (May 5-6, 2004). Tert-butyl Alcohol Liability and Toxicology, A National Problem and Unquantified Liability. *National Groundwater Association. Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Congress Plaza Hotel, Chicago Illinois.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (March 2004). Perchlorate Toxicology. *Meeting of the American Groundwater Trust*. Lecture conducted from Phoenix Arizona.

Hagemann, M.F., **Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and Rob Hesse (2004). Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. *Meeting of tribal representatives*. Lecture conducted from Parker, AZ.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (April 7, 2004). A National Damage Assessment Model for PCE and Dry Cleaners. *Drycleaner Symposium. California Ground Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Radison Hotel, Sacramento, California.

**Rosenfeld, P. E**., Grey, M., (June 2003) Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Seventh International In Situ And On Site Bioremediation Symposium Battelle Conference* Orlando, FL.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and James Clark Ph.D. (February 20-21, 2003) Understanding Historical Use, Chemical Properties, Toxicity and Regulatory Guidance of 1,4 Dioxane. *National Groundwater Association. Southwest Focus Conference. Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants*. Lecture conducted from Hyatt Regency Phoenix Arizona.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (February 6-7, 2003). Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *California CUPA Forum*. Lecture conducted from Marriott Hotel, Anaheim California.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D**. (October 23, 2002) Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *EPA Underground Storage Tank Roundtable*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Understanding Odor from Compost, *Wastewater and Industrial Processes. Sixth Annual Symposium on Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Using High Carbon Wood Ash to Control Compost Odor. *Sixth Annual Symposium on Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** and Grey, M. A. (September 22-24, 2002). Biocycle Composting for Coastal Sage Restoration. *Northwest Biosolids Management Association*. Lecture conducted from Vancouver Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Grey, M. A. (November 11-14, 2002). Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Soil Science Society Annual Conferenc*e. Lecture conducted from Indianapolis, Maryland.

**Rosenfeld. P.E.** (September 16, 2000). Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Water Environment Federation.* Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

**Rosenfeld. P.E. (**October 16, 2000). Wood ash and biofilter control of compost odor. *Biofest.* Lecture conducted from Ocean Shores, California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E. (**2000). Bioremediation Using Organic Soil Amendments. *California Resource Recovery Association*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation with High-Carbon Wood-Ash. *Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings*. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, and C.L. Henry. (1999). An evaluation of ash incorporation with biosolids for odor reduction. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Salt Lake City Utah.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Comparison of Microbial Activity and Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Brown and Caldwell.* Lecture conducted from Seattle Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. *Biofest.* Lecture conducted from Lake Chelan, Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E,** C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation with High-Carbon Wood-Ash. Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. B. Harrison, and R. Dills. (1997). Comparison of Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

## Teaching Experience:

UCLA Department of Environmental Health (Summer 2003 through 20010) Taught Environmental Health Science 100 to students, including undergrad, medical doctors, public health professionals and nurses. The course focused on the health effects of environmental contaminants.

National Ground Water Association, Successful Remediation Technologies. Custom Course in Sante Fe, New Mexico. May 21, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of fuel contaminants associated with underground storage tanks.

National Ground Water Association; Successful Remediation Technologies Course in Chicago Illinois. April 1, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of contaminants associated with Superfund and RCRA sites.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, April and May 2001. Alternative Landfill Caps Seminar in San Diego, Ventura, and San Francisco. Focused on both prescriptive and innovative landfill cover design.

UCLA Department of Environmental Engineering, February 5, 2002. Seminar on Successful Remediation Technologies focusing on Groundwater Remediation.

University Of Washington, Soil Science Program, Teaching Assistant for several courses including Soil Chemistry, Organic Soil Amendments, and Soil Stability.

U.C. Berkeley, Environmental Science Program Teaching Assistant for Environmental Science 10.

## Academic Grants Awarded:

California Integrated Waste Management Board. $41,000 grant awarded to UCLA Institute of the Environment. Goal: To investigate the effect of high carbon wood ash on volatile organic emissions from compost. 2001.

Synagro Technologies, Corona California: $10,000 grant awarded to San Diego State University.
Goal: investigate the effect of biosolids for restoration and remediation of degraded coastal sage soils. 2000.

King County, Department of Research and Technology, Washington State. $100,000 grant awarded to University of Washington: Goal: To investigate odor emissions from biosolids application and the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions. 1998.

Northwest Biosolids Management Association, Washington State. $20,000 grant awarded to investigate the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions from biosolids. 1997.

James River Corporation, Oregon: $10,000 grant was awarded to investigate the success of genetically engineered Poplar trees with resistance to round-up. 1996.

United State Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest: $15,000 grant was awarded to investigating fire ecology of the Tahoe National Forest. 1995.

Kellogg Foundation, Washington D.C. $500 grant was awarded to construct a large anaerobic digester on St. Kitts in West Indies. 1993

## Deposition and/or Trial Testimony:

In the District Court of Harris County Texas
Mt Davis Interest, Inc v Sesco Cement Corp
Cause No 2023-26512
Trial 6-6-2-25

In the United States Southern District of New York
Gallo vs Avon Products Inc., et al
Civil Action No.: 1:23-cv-2023
Deposition 4-24-2025

In Vanderburgh Superior Court 5, County of Vanderburgh, Indiana
Markello v CSX
Civil Action No 82D05-2011-CT-004962
Deposition 3-26-25

Iin the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Jarosiewicz v Northeast Regional Railroad
Case No 2023 L 002290
Deposition 2-27-25

In the District Court 191st Judicial District Dallas County
Acklin v Poly America International
Cause No DC-22-08610
Deposition 1-8-2025

United States District Court, Norther District of California
Asustin Vs Monsanto
Case No 2:23-cv-272
Deposition 12-20-25

In Jefferson Circuit Court Division One, Louisville, Kentucky
Stafford vs, CSX
Case No. 18-CI-001790

Deposition: 8-27-24

In the Twenty-Second Judicial Circuit of St. Louis. State of Missouri
Patricia Godfrey vs, Amtrak
Case No. 2122-CC-00525
Deposition: 7-17-24

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Linda Early Vs. CSX
Case number CV-2021-00241
Deposition 6-24-24

In the Court of Common Please Lucas County, Ohio
Brenda Conkright vs. CSX
Case No. G-4801-CI-0202102664-000
Deposition: 6-4-24

In the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Greenup Circuit Court
Patsy Sue Napier vs. CSX
Case No. 19-CI-0012
Deposition: 5-8-2-24

In United States District Court of Hawaii
Patrick Feindt, Jr. et al. vs. The United States of America
Case No. 1:22-cv-LEK-KJM
Trial 3-29-24 and 4-5-24

In the District Court of Hood County State of Texas
Artie Gray vs. Exxon Mobil
Case No. C-2018047
Rosenfeld Deposition:4-22-2024

In the Elkhart Superior Court State of Indiana
Estate of Clark Stacy vs. Penn Central Corporation
Cause No 2D01-2001-CT-00007
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-25-2024 and 3-7-2024

In the Circuit Court of Trempealeau County, State of Wisconsin
Michael J. Sylla et al. vs. High-Crush Whitehall LLC
Case No. 2019-CV-63, 2019-CV-64, 2019-CV-65, 2019-CV-66
Rosenfeld Deposition: 3-5-2024

In the Circuit Court of Trempealeau County, State of Wisconsin
Leland Drangstveit vs. High-Crush Blair LLC
Case No. 19-CV-66
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-5-2024

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Donald Lee Ashworth vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No CV-2021-901261
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-23-2024

In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
Gary L Siepe vs. Soo Line Railroad
Case No. 2:21-cv-00919
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-19-2024

In the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana
Ricky Bush v. Clean Harbors Colfax LLC
Case No. 1:22-cv-02026-DDD-JPM
Rosenfeld Deposition 12-18-2023 and 1-15-2024

In United States District Court of Hawaii
Patrick Feindt, Jr. et al. vs. The United States of America
Case No. 1:22-cv-LEK-KJM
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-29-2023

In the Circuit Court for the Twentieth Judicial Circuit St. Clair County, Illinois
Timothy Gray vs. Rural King et al.
Case No 2022-LA-355
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-26-2023

In United States District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin
Gary L. Siepe vs. Soo Line Railroad Company
Case No. 2:21-cv-00919
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-15-2023

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Donald Fox vs. BNSF
Case No. 2021 L12
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-12-2023

In the Court of Common Please Cuyahoga County, Ohio
Thomas Schleich vs. Penn Central Corporation
Lead Case No. CV-20-939184
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-27-2023

In the Circuit Court of Jackson County Missouri at Kansas City
Timothy Dalsing vs. BNSF
Case No. No. 2216-cv06539
Rosenfeld Deposition 7-28-2023

In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas Houston Division
International Terminals Company LLC Deer Park Fire Litigation
Lead Case No. 4:19-cv-01460
Rosenfeld Deposition 7-25-2023

In the Circuit Court of Livingston County Missouri
Shirley Ralls vs. Canadian Pacific Railway and Soo Lind Railroad
Case No. 28LV-CV0020
Rosenfeld Daubert Hearing 7-18-2023 Trial Testimony 7-19-2023

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Brenda Wright vs. Penn Central and Conrail
Case No. No. 2032L003966
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-13-2023

In the Circuit Court Common Please Philadelphia of Jefferson County Alabama
Frank Belle vs. Birmingham Southern Railroad Company et al.
Case No. 01-cv-2021-900901.00
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-6-2023

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Linda De Gregorio vs. Penn Central
Case No. 002278
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-27-20203

In the United States District Court Eastern District of New York
Rosalie Romano et al. vs. Northrup Grumman Corporation
Case No. 16-cv-5760
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-16-2023

In the Superior Court of Washington, Spokane County
Judy Cundy vs. BNSF
Case No. 21-2-03718-32
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-9-2023

In The Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, PA Civil Trial Division
Feaster v Conrail
Case No. 001075
Rosenfeld Deposition 2-1-2023

In United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
Sherman vs. BNSF
Case No. 3:17-cv-01192
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-18-2023

In United States District Court District of Colorado
Gonzales vs. BNSF
Case No. 1:21-cv-01690
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-17-2023

In United States District Court District of Colorado
Abeyta vs. BNSF
Case No. 1:21-cv-01689-KMT
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-3-2023

In United States District Court For The Easter District of Louisiana
Nathaniel Smith vs. Illinois Central Railroad
Case No. 2:21-cv-01235
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-30-2022

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Billy Wildrick, Plaintiff vs. BNSF Railway Company
Case No. CIVDS1711810
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-17-2022

In the State Court of Bibb County, State of Georgia
Richard Hutcherson, Plaintiff vs Norfolk Southern Railway Company
Case No. 10-SCCV-092007
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2022

In the Civil District Court of the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana
Millard Clark, Plaintiff vs. Dixie Carriers, Inc. et al.
Case No. 2020-03891
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-15-2022

In The Circuit Court of Livingston County, State of Missouri, Circuit Civil Division

Shirley Ralls, Plaintiff vs. Canadian Pacific Railway and Soo Line Railroad
Case No. 18-LV-CC0020
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-7-2022

In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jonny C. Daniels, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. 20-CA-5502
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-1-2022

In The Circuit Court of St. Louis County, State of Missouri
Kieth Luke et. al. Plaintiff vs. Monsanto Company et. al.
Case No. 19SL-CC03191
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-25-2022

In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jeffery S. Lamotte, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. NO. 20-CA-0049
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-22-2022

In State of Minnesota District Court, County of St. Louis Sixth Judicial District
Greg Bean, Plaintiff vs. Soo Line Railroad Company
Case No. 69-DU-CV-21-760
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-17-2022

In United States District Court Western District of Washington at Tacoma, Washington
John D. Fitzgerald Plaintiff vs. BNSF
Case No. 3:21-cv-05288-RJB
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-11-2022

In Circuit Court of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, Macon Illinois
Rocky Bennyhoff Plaintiff vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-L-56
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-3-2022, Trial 1-10-2023

In Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County Ohio
Joe Briggins Plaintiff vs. CSX
Case No. A2004464
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-17-2022

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern
George LaFazia vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. BCV-19-103087
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-17-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Bobby Earles vs. Penn Central et. al.
Case No. 2020-L-000550
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-16-2022

In United States District Court Easter District of Florida
Albert Hartman Plaintiff vs. Illinois Central
Case No. 2:20-cv-1633
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-4-2022

In the Circuit Court of the 4th Judicial Circuit, in and For Duval County, Florida
Barbara Steele vs. CSX Transportation

Case No.16-219-Ca-008796
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2022

In United States District Court Easter District of New York
Romano et al. vs. Northrup Grumman Corporation
Case No. 16-cv-5760
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-10-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Linda Benjamin vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 007599
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Donald Smith vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 003426
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-24-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Jan Holeman vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 000675
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-18-2022

In the State Court of Bibb County State of Georgia
Dwayne B. Garrett vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-SCCV-091232
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-10-2021

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Ruepke vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 007730
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-5-2021

In the United States District Court For the District of Nebraska
Steven Gillett vs. BNSF
Case No. 4:20-cv-03120
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-28-2021

In the Montana Thirteenth District Court of Yellowstone County
James Eadus vs. Soo Line Railroad and BNSF
Case No. DV 19-1056
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-21-2021

In the Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al. vs Cerro Flow Products, Inc.
Case No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-14-2021
Trial October 8-4-2021

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Rafferty vs. Consolidated Rail Corporation and National Railroad Passenger Corporation d/b/a AMTRAK,
Case No. 18-L-6845
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-28-2021

In the United States District Court For the Northern District of Illinois

Theresa Romcoe vs. Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation d/b/a METRA Rail
Case No. 17-cv-8517
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-25-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of Arizona In and For the Cunty of Maricopa
Mary Tryon et al. vs. The City of Pheonix v. Cox Cactus Farm, L.L.C., Utah Shelter Systems, Inc.
Case No. CV20127-094749
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-7-2021

In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas Beaumont Division
Robinson, Jeremy et al vs. CNA Insurance Company et al.
Case No. 1:17-cv-000508
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-25-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Gary Garner, Personal Representative for the Estate of Melvin Garner vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. 1720288
Rosenfeld Deposition 2-23-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Spring Street Courthouse
Benny M Rodriguez vs. Union Pacific Railroad, A Corporation, et al.
Case No. 18STCV01162
Rosenfeld Deposition 12-23-2020

In the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri
Karen Cornwell, Plaintiff, vs. Marathon Petroleum, LP, Defendant.
Case No. 1716-CV10006
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-30-2019

In the United States District Court For The District of New Jersey
Duarte et al, Plaintiffs, vs. United States Metals Refining Company et. al. Defendant.
Case No. 2:17-cv-01624-ES-SCM
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-7-2019

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
M/T Carla Maersk vs. Conti 168., Schiffahrts-GMBH & Co. Bulker KG MS "Conti Perdido" Defendant.
Case No. 3:15-CV-00106 consolidated with 3:15-CV-00237
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-9-2019

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
Carole-Taddeo-Bates et al., vs. Ifran Khan et al., Defendants
Case No. BC615636
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2019

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments et al. vs El Adobe Apts. Inc. et al., Defendants
Case No. BC646857
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2018; Trial 3-7-19

In United States District Court For The District of Colorado
Bells et al. Plaintiffs vs. The 3M Company et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:16-cv-02531-RBJ
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2018 and 4-3-2018

In The District Court Of Regan County, Texas, 112th Judicial District
Phillip Bales et al., Plaintiff vs. Dow Agrosciences, LLC, et al., Defendants

Cause No. 1923
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-17-2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Contra Costa
Simons et al., Plaintifs vs. Chevron Corporation, et al., Defendants
Cause No. C12-01481
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-20-2017

In The Circuit Court of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al., Plaintiff vs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc., Defendants
Case No.: No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-23-2017

In United States District Court For The Southern District of Mississippi
Guy Manuel vs. The BP Exploration et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:19-cv-00315-RHW
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-22-2020

In The Superior Court of the State of California, For The County of Los Angeles
Warrn Gilbert and Penny Gilber, Plaintiff vs. BMW of North America LLC
Case No. LC102019 (c/w BC582154)
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-16-2017, Trail 8-28-2018

In the Northern District Court of Mississippi, Greenville Division
Brenda J. Cooper, et al., Plaintifs, vs. Meritor Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 4:16-cv-52-DMB-JVM
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of Washington, County of Snohomish
Michael Davis and Julie Davis et al., Plaintiff vs. Cedar Grove Composting Inc., Defendants
Case No. 13-2-03987-5
Rosenfeld Deposition, February 2017
Trial March 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda
Charles Spain., Plaintiff vs. Thermo Fisher Scientific, et al., Defendants
Case No. RG14711115
Rosenfeld Deposition September 2015

In The Iowa District Court In And For Poweshiek County
Russell D. Winburn, et al., Plaintiffs vs. Doug Hoksbergen, et al., Defendants
Case No. LALA002187
Rosenfeld Deposition August 2015

In The Circuit Court of Ohio County, West Virginia
Robert Andrews, et al. vs. Antero, et al.
Civil Action No. 14-C-30000
Rosenfeld Deposition June 2015

In The Iowa District Court for Muscatine County
Laurie Freeman et. al. Plaintiffs vs. Grain Processing Corporation, Defendant
Case No. 4980
Rosenfeld Deposition May 2015

In the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit, in and For Broward County, Florida
Walter Hinton, et. al. Plaintiff, vs. City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a Municipality, Defendant.

Case No. CACE07030358 (26)
Rosenfeld Deposition December 2014

In the United States District Court Western District of Oklahoma
Tommy McCarty, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Oklahoma City Landfill, LLC d/b/a Southeast Oklahoma City Landfill, et al. Defendants.
Case No. 5:12-cv-01152-C
Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2014

In the County Court of Dallas County Texas
Lisa Parr et al, *Plaintiff*, vs. Aruba et al, *Defendant.*
Case Number cc-11-01650-E
Rosenfeld Deposition: March and September 2013
Rosenfeld Trial: April 2014

In the County of Kern, Unlimited Jurisdiction
Rose Propagation Services vs. Heppe Enterprises
Case No. S-1500-CV-278190, LHB
Rosenfeld Deposition: May 2014

In the Circuit Court of Baltimore County Maryland
Philip E. Cvach, II et al., *Plaintiffs* vs. Two Farms, Inc. d/b/a Royal Farms, Defendants
Case Number: 03-C-12-012487 OT
Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2013

In the Court of Galveston County, Texas 56th Judicial District
MDL Litigation Regarding Texas City Refinery Ultracracker Emission Event Litigation
Cause No. 10-UC-0001
Rosenfeld Deposition: March 2013
Rosenfeld Trial: September 2013

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
Kyle Cannon, Eugene Donovan, Genaro Ramirez, Carol Sassler, and Harvey Walton, each Individually and on behalf of those similarly situated, *Plaintiffs,* vs. BP Products North America, Inc., *Defendant.*
Case 3:10-cv-00622
Rosenfeld Deposition: February 2012
Rosenfeld Trial: April 2013

In the United States District court of Southern District of California
United States of America, Plaintiff vs. 2,560 Acres of Land, more or less, located in Imperial County, State of California; and Donald L. Crawford, et. al.
Civil No. 3:11-cv-02258-IEG-RBB
Rosenfeld Deposition: December 2012, January 2013

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition October 2012

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., *Plaintiffs,* vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., *Defendants*
Case Number: 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition: October 2012

In the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, Northern Division
James K. Benefield, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. International Paper Company, Defendant.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Harrison |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Coalition Letter Supporting Family Zoning Plan: File No. 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 12:42:42 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Outlook-A black an.png<br>Full BOS Coalition Letter of Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

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

Hello,

Please find the attached letter on behalf of our undersigned organizations in support of the Family Zoning Plan, File No. 250966. Thank you.

All the best,

**David Harrison** *(He/Him)*
Director of Public Policy
(O) 415-352-8803 (C) 202-262-5860
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 760
San Francisco, CA 94104

December 1, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**RE: Business Community Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan**

Dear Supervisors,

As leaders in the San Francisco business community, representing employers of all sizes and industries, we know that a strong economy depends on sufficient housing for workers and families. We, the undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for Mayor Daniel Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco continues to face a severe housing shortage that impacts workers, families, and businesses across the city. Too many employees who power our economy are forced to live far from their jobs, enduring long commutes that strain families, limit career opportunities, and weaken connections to our neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan helps address this challenge by expanding opportunities for family sized housing in more neighborhoods while providing safeguards for small businesses and keeping San Francisco eligible for critical state housing and infrastructure funding.

**Economic Benefits for Businesses of All Sizes**

Building enough housing to meet our city's needs could generate nearly $5.6 billion dollars in new spending at local businesses. By concentrating new homes near commercial corridors, this plan will increase foot traffic, create opportunities for ground floor retail, and provide a stable customer base for neighborhood serving businesses. These benefits extend across industries,

strengthen our ability to attract and retain talent, and help ensure that San Francisco remains a competitive place to grow jobs.

**Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses**

We recognize that land use changes can raise important questions for small businesses. Importantly, the vast majority of future housing under this plan will be built on underutilized sites such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings. This will preserve existing storefronts while revitalizing parcels that present the best opportunities for redevelopment.

In the limited cases where relocation may be necessary, the Family Zoning Plan now includes adopted safeguards that give small businesses greater clarity and support. Supervisor Myrna Melgar's Small Business Displacement Program, which has now passed first reading, provides relocation payments, waived permit fees, and dedicated support to small and legacy businesses that may be affected by redevelopment related to the plan. The plan also requires early notification to commercial tenants as soon as a permit is pulled, giving businesses more predictability and time to plan for any potential changes.

In addition, the Planning Department has developed new incentives to ensure that ground floor retail in new buildings is functional, economically viable, and designed to support vibrant commercial corridors. These tools help facilitate tenant buildouts and encourage activated storefronts that strengthen neighborhood vitality.

**Shared Vision for San Francisco's Future**

The Family Zoning Plan is a critical step toward addressing our city's housing needs while ensuring that small businesses, large employers, and working families all have a path to thrive. By making it possible for more workers to live near their jobs, San Francisco will strengthen its workforce, reduce congestion and pollution from long commutes, and create a healthier and more equitable city for everyone. When our workforce can afford to live in our city, employers are better able to retain talent, reduce turnover, and build a stronger, more stable workforce.

We appreciate your leadership in approving the Family Zoning Plan and the accompanying small business protections. We stand ready to work alongside you in building a more economically inclusive, vibrant, and strong San Francisco.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

**San Francisco Chamber of Commerce**
Rodney Fong, President & CEO

**Bay Area Council**
Matt Regan, Senior Vice President, Public Policy

**SPUR**
Sujata Srivastava, Chief Policy Officer

**Advance SF**
Wade Rose, President and CEO

**Hospital Council Northern and Central California**
Michon Coleman, Regional Vice President, San Francisco Section

**Golden Gate Restaurant Association**
Laurie Thomas, Executive Director

**Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco**
John Bryant, CEO

**SF New Deal**
Simon Bertrang, Executive Director

**San Francisco Apartment Association**
Janan New, Executive Director

**East Cut Community Benefit District**
Andrew Robinson, Executive Director

**Kate Robinson**
Chair, San Francisco Benefit District Alliance

**Ben Blieman**
President, California Nightlife Association

**Cynthia Huie**
President, Small Business Commission

**Sharky Laguana**
Former President, Small Business Commission & CEO, Bandago

**Teddy Kramer**
CEO and Founder, NEON

**Manny Yekutiel**
Owner, Manny's

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Richard Drury |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); CPC.SF.Housing.Choice; CPC.FamilyZoningCEQA; Shum, Ryan (CPC) |
| **Cc:** | Lori Brooke |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 9:02:59 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.12.02.SF Rezone Supoplemental BOS ComLtr-PDF w Exhibit.pdf |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:
Attached please find the supplemental comments of Neighborhoods United SF concerning the San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan." Board of Supervisors December 2, 2025. Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985.
Thank you for considering our comments, and please include these comments in the record for this matter.
Richard Drury

--
Richard Drury
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 836-4200
richard@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL

December 2, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Land Use and Transportation Committee c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, CPC, cpc.FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org; ryan.shum@sfgov.org

**RE: Comment on CEQA Addendum for San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan."**
**Board of Supervisors December 2, 2025.**
**Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985**

President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing on behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, a consortium of San Francisco neighborhood and community groups representing thousands of San Francisco residents, concerning the so-called San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan" ("Rezone"). This letter supplements our filing yesterday in which we requested that the Board defer any decision on the Rezone until the City Planning Department prepares a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR").

We attach hereto the shadow "heat map" prepared by Adam Noble of FastCast showing that the Rezone will have dramatic shadow impacts on Joe DiMaggio Park. This is a zero-tolerance park under the City's Prop M (Planning Code Section 295). This is a new significant impact of the Rezone that must be analyzed in an SEIR, along with the

impacts discussed in yesterday's letter. We urge the City to prepare a SEIR to consider feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Rezone's impacts, and also to consider feasible alternatives, such as placing the proposed 4,000 additional units in specific locations, rather than upzoning entire swaths of the city in hopes that the 4,000 units will be built somewhere within the upzoned areas. We do not need to destroy the City to save it. Instead, the necessary new development can be place in areas of the City where it will not destroy rent-controlled housing and where it will not destroy functional, urban communities.

Sincerely,



Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

EXHIBIT B




## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Full Year Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

| | |
|---|---|
| Under 2 min/day | (under 13 hrs/year) |
| 2 - 4 min/day | (13 - 25 hrs/year) |
| 4 - 8 min/day | (25 - 49 hrs/year) |
| 8 - 16 min/day | (49 - 98 hrs/year) |
| 16 - 32 min/day | (98 - 195 hrs/year) |
| 32 - 64 min/day | (195 - 390 hrs/year) |
| 64 - 128 min/day | (390 - 779 hrs/year) |
| Over 128 min/day | (over 779 hrs/year) |

# FULL YEAR

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

Joe DiMaggio Playground*

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

40’

50’

65’

Shadow Fan is cropped to park boundaries

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JUNE 21

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JUNE 28

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 5

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 12

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 19

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# JULY 26

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 2

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 9

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 16

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 23

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# AUGUST 30

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 6

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 13

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 20

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# SEPTEMBER 27

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 4

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 11

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 18

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# OCTOBER 25

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 1

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 8

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 15

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 22

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# NOVEMBER 29

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day




## NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

### Duration Range of Net New Shadow

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# DECEMBER 6

### SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# DECEMBER 13

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

# FAMILY ZONING SHADOW ANALYSIS

## Joe DiMaggio Playground, Single Day

### NET NEW SHADOW LOCATIONS & DURATIONS

Single Day Distribution

**Duration Range of Net New Shadow**

- Over 16 hr
- 8 hr - 16 hr
- 4 hr - 8 hr
- 2 hr - 4 hr
- 1 hr - 2 hr
- 30 min - 1 hr
- 15 min - 30 min
- 1 min - 15 min

# DECEMBER 20

**SHADOW FAN ANALYSIS**

Rec & Park Open Spaces

- Joe DiMaggio Playground

Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40’
- 50’
- 65’

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bruce Agid |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Alan.Wong1@sfgov.org; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Meaghan Mitchell; Tyra Fennell; Sean Karlin; Amerika Sanchez; Charley Goss; Derek Lee; Kurt Grimes; Chris Chang; Maika Pinkston; Latoya Pitcher; Spencer Lam; Eric Dew; Mark Malouf; Alan Tsui; Rachael Tanner; Gary Pegueros; Chanel Blackwell; Elijah Ball; Courtney Sid; sliubettencourt@gmail.com; JiLon Li; Rupali Singhal; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Herrera, Ana (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Mathew Castillon; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Thongsavat, Adam (MYR); Zou, Han (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (SFENDC) Support for Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 9:01:55 AM |

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

December 2, 2025

RE: Support Mayor Lurie’s Family Zoning Plan

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Board of the Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (ENDC) supports the passage and adoption of Mayor Lurie’s Family Zoning Plan.

This proposal plans to build more housing for San Franciscans while ensuring we can control our own destiny by maintaining local land use controls. Without the Family Zoning Plan, San Francisco will face the Builder’s Remedy as well as fines and loss of ~$100 million in funding for transit and housing. Furthermore, this plan incentivizes family-sized homes of at least two, three, or more bedrooms. These types of homes help more families stay in San Francisco.

The plan aligns with ENDC's Mission & Vision. The San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club (ENDC) was established by residents of San Francisco’s Supervisorial Districts 3, 6, and 10 to organize voters and provide a discussion and educational forum to address the most pressing issues facing the eastern neighborhoods of our City.

The ENDC provides a Democratic political voice to advocate an urbanist-equity platform (a focus on creating complete communities) with twin goals of keeping current residents and families in San Francisco while welcoming newcomers. The Family Zoning Plan aligns firmly with these values.

We are proud to support the Family Zoning Plan, which incorporates many important accepted amendments, and urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt the plan without delay.

Thanks in advance,

Bruce Agid
President, ENDC on behalf of the Board of ENDC

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Howard |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Shum, Ryan (CPC); CPC.SF.Housing.Choice; FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org |
| **Subject:** | UPZONING: ANALYSIS: PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, December 2, 2025 7:28:54 AM |
| **Attachments:** | ~~~~PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING 12-25.pdf |

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

FOR HEARINGS ON UPZONING PLAN
**TO:** Board of Supervisors
**CC:** Mayor Lurie/ Office, Planning Commission/ Staff
**ATTACHED: PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING**

An entertaining and informative analysis of the history of Waterfront Land-Use Battles, development fights, upzoning, housing options, affordable housing around the world and photos.
Best Regards, Howard Wong, AIA
**P.S.: Please include in Board Package---online and printed (if possible) for public education.**

# PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING

## OPPOSE WATERFRONT UPZONING *Please share this!*

**SEE BELOW: HISTORY OF SF WATERFRONT LAND-USE BATTLES:**

PROTECT WATERFRONT BEAUTY AND HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOODS AS ECONOMIC ASSETS
San Francisco's waterfront/ hilltop beauty is priceless. Environmental capital, like physical/ visual links to the Bay, has quantifiable value. The City's Mediterranean beauty differentiates it from most cities. Tourism attracts 23 million visitors and $9 billion/ year. Public vistas fuel a real estate industry of up to $10 billion/ year. Conservatively, waterfront beauty has a $2 billion valuation/ year---for perpetuity.

**History makes the case for Voter Approval of waterfront development/ height increases**
Generations of San Franciscans have fought to protect the beauty and scale of the northern waterfront. Upzoning at the northern waterfront would override General Plans, urban design/ environmental elements, planning priorities, design guidelines, settled law, ballot measures, legislation, codes, and voter advocacy for a Mediterranean scale---with building heights tapering gently upward to hilltops.

**Planning codes have reinforced the waterfront's 40-foot height limit** as a benchmark for tapering heights---protecting visual corridors to the bay. Public and legal directives have elevated environmental beauty as a priority, aspiring to the beauty of Venice, Florence, Santorini, Paris and great places that have protected their timeless treasures and World Heritage Sites---actual and potential.

## HOUSING: SUPERLATIVE OPTIONS *Please share this!*

INSTEAD OF PLANNERS, HIRE MATHEMATICIANS AND FINANCIERS TO CREATE NEW HOUSING.
San Francisco's Chief Economist deems the SF Upzoning Plan as unrealistic. ***Why approve a deleterious upzoning plan, harming neighborhoods and waterfronts, when better options exist?*** Throughout the world, cities/ countries/ people have built vast amounts of affordable housing for their growing populations. Besides, San Francisco has already built, entitled more projects, and forecasts more development than almost any city in the region and state.

**Mathematicians can finetune hypotheses and calculate housing construction accurately.**
Depending on the timeline, completed projects, in-progress projects, entitled projects, proposed projects (more every day), untapped zoning capacity, infill development, availability of public land, new financing plans, new area/ neighborhood plans, and revised incentives/ housing types/ unit sizes/ densification, San Francisco can likely meet its RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation)---without flailing citywide upzoning. Rather than number of housing units, the focus should be on the number of people housed.

**Financiers can coalesce all funding to effectively build housing:** $20 billion MTC Regional Affordable Housing Bond (2028 as a revolving fund), local/ state housing bonds, grants, trust funds, tax credits, tax increment financing, low-interest loans, public banks, nonprofits, philanthropy, partnerships, rent subsidies, and more. Many countries have affordable housing strategies and programs---worth emulating. ***Affordable housing is not for lack of zoning, but lack of comprehensive planning.***

**DO THE MATH: HOUSING TAKES MANY FORMS:** After the 1906 Earthquake, 250,000 San Franciscans were homeless (60% of the population)---quickly housed in tens/t camps and tiny redwood cottages. Today, the homeless instinctively gather in encampments, RV/ car clusters, for community and self-support. As seen throughout the world, affordable housing can take the form of cooperative housing, micro-housing, shared housing, land trusts, accessory units, modular dwellings, single-room occupancies, boarding houses, public housing, dual-use spaces, and informal communities (at least for the near/ short term). Rio de Janeiro's favelas are naturally-occurring low-income squatter housing---a normal human response to homelessness. 35% of Lima's population live in squatter settlements and 50% are employed in informal jobs. Around the world, 1 billion people live in slums or other informal settlements.

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS A PUBLIC POLICY CHOICE.** Government has economic tools to invest in land, utilize public property, zone for public benefits, provide public services, incentivize smaller/ plentiful dwellings, provide flexibility in housing, give tax incentives, prioritize approvals and permitting. Not inconceivable, like China and forty other countries, government can build new cities and towns---on public land. China has built hundreds of new cities, including many with one million residents. ***The region and the state can carry its housing fair share, not just the 49 square miles of San Francisco.***

**RENTCHAMBER: The Top 10 Countries with Exceptional Housing Policies**
**https://rentchamber.com/the-top-10-countries-with-exceptional-housing-policies/**
**WIKIPEDIA: Affordable Housing by Country:**
**https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Affordable_housing_by_country**

**GUARDIAN: The social housing secret: how Vienna became the world's most livable city**
**https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2024/jan/10/the-social-housing-secret-how-vienna-became-the-worlds-most-livable-city**
**NPR: Could this city be the model for how to tackle the housing crisis and climate change?**
**https://www.npr.org/2025/06/15/nx-s1-5400642/affordable-housing-environment-vienna-climate-change**
**HOUSING PERSPECTIVES: What Can We Learn from the Dutch Social Housing System?**
**https://www.jchs.harvard.edu/blog/what-can-we-learn-dutch-social-housing-system**
**ASSEMBLE PAPERS: A primer on social housing in Amsterdam**
**https://assemblepapers.com.au/2018/12/13/amsterdam-social-housing-a-primer/**
**ROUTE FIFTY: Hungry for affordable housing, communities turn to land trusts** **https://www.route-fifty.com/management/2024/09/hungry-affordable-housing-communities-turn-land-trusts/399784/?oref=rf-today-nl&utm_source=Sailthru&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Route%20Fifty%20Today:%20September%2025%2C%202024&utm_term=newsletter_rf_today**
**BLOOMBERG: Why Singapore Has One of the Highest Home Ownership Rates**
**https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-07-08/behind-the-design-of-singapore-s-low-cost-housing?cmpid=BBD102120_CITYLAB&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&utm_term=201021&utm_campaign=citylabdaily**

**WATERFRONT BEAUTY = BEST ECONOMICS** ***Please share this!***

# HISTORY: SF WATERFRONT LAND-USE BATTLES

**Over time, by tapering heights downward towards the waterfront, public vistas and San Francisco's hills/ beauty will be preserved for all---an economic asset that attracts 23 million visitors and $9 billion per year.**

**SAN FRANCISCO HAS THWARTED DARWINIAN MARKET FORCES**, which threaten prime waterfront sites for obstructive development. Big money is spent to push projects by the few who benefit financially---developers, contractors, consultants, public relations firms, city staff, politicians, and groups that reap donations, fees, payments, and wages. Instead, citizens/ height limits/ codes have protected our Mediterranean village-like character for all.

**SAN FRANCISCO'S WATERFRONT BATTLES** led to protective tapering height limits, which preserve public vistas and a Mediterranean village-like beauty for everyone. Powerful special interests attempt to override codes---to gain extraordinary favors. Each code exemption is used to justify subsequent height increases----a never-ending ratcheting upward. Learning from history, we can better appreciate the waterfront's esthetic and economic value.

The Fontana Towers led to the 40-foot height limit on the waterfront.

The Fontana Towers battle stopped five other high-rises at Aquatic Park.

San Francisco's Freeway Revolt started a national movement.

The Embarcadero Freeway was stopped at Broadway---in mid-construction.

The Embarcadero Freeways demolition opened the waterfront.

Freeway plans wrapped around the entire waterfront and throughout the city.

WPA Freeway Plan, around northern waterfront---and over Columbus Ave.



The freeway wall along the waterfront was a near reality.




"Save The Bay" map and Reber Plan for bay infill.

Citizen activists and founders of "Save The Bay": Esther Gulick, Sylvia McLaughlin, Catherine Kerr.

**HISTORY TEACHES US** that many design options exist for any site---like fully code-compliant alternatives or open space. After contentious debates, better designs often result.
FOUNDSF: The Fontana Towers and Waterfront Battle.
**http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=Height_Limit_Revolt_Saves_Waterfront_Vistas**
Residents of Russian Hill and Attorney Casper Weinberger (a Republican conservationist) stopped towers along the waterfront. A coalition fought for the waterfront 40-foot height limits. Later, height limits on Russian Hill were passed.

Bridge and large development proposed adjacent to Telegraph Hill---through North Beach.

Bridge and freeways proposed atop Telegraph Hill.



The Rush Bridge from Telegraph Hill had three stories of traffic lanes.



Proposed bridge from Telegraph Hill to Angel Island & Tiburon---stopped by Washington officials.

Russian Hill: Ten years after 40-foot height limit.



Ferry Building Project (1968) with helipad atop roof.

World Trade Center (1950) demolishes Ferry Building.

World Trade Center's terraced high-rises at waterfront.

Proposed 30-story skyscraper at waterfront.



U.S. Steel Building Complex---South of Ferry Building.

Embarcadero Crescent (1961): Ferry Building to Aquatic Park.

Embarcadero Crescent (1961): Bay development east of Telegraph Hill.

The 1963 Downtown Plan had two high-rises flanking the saved Ferry Building's tower.

Old Produce Market's tenants fought and were displaced by the Golden Gateway towers.

Instead of more Golden Gateway towers, activists fought for the low-rise Golden Gateway Commons.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL**: A long-term economic measure includes incorporating "natural capital"---the value of such things as esthetics, nature, and generic diversity---into economic decision-making. From a long-range perspective, waterfront beauty has incalculable economic value---for regional drawing power and people's happiness quotient.

Russian Hill Towers (1958): Mies van der Rohe proposal with block-long parking garage.



Port Authority Plan (1959: Office buildings, hotel, commercial, terminal….

International Market Place (1968): Multiblock complex at foot of Telegraph Hill.

Ferry Building Plans (1968): Northern Waterfront Plan.



Port Plaza Project (1970)" Ferry Building and Pier 1.

Villamarina Project (1974): The piers and area around Aquatic Park developed.

Pei-Cobb-Fried Proposal (1980)" Office and commercial at Ferry Building and Pier 1.

Koll's Sailing Center (1980)" Piers at Bay Bridge---Hotel, restaurant, retail, marina….

SWL 330 Condo Tower (2006) built though Pier 30-32 cruise terminal cancelled.

Arena/ Condo Project (2014): Entertainment venue and condo towers around Pier 30-32---moved.

**THE DEVELOPER-POLITICAL COMPLEX** of financial interests works to heighten development, to escalate land values and to transfer public assets to private interests. Freeways and subways are regional escalators of real estate values by promoting well-heeled commuters. The Developer-Political Complex is a network of financial self-interests --- developers, realtors, contractors, consultants, public relations firms, politicians, city staff, nonprofits, and groups who receive donations, fees, payments, and wages. Citizens have rightfully fought for their assets.

> FOUNDSF: "The Freeway Revolt" **http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=The_Freeway_Revolt**
> **O**n November 2, 1956 the *San Francisco Chronicle* graciously published a map of the proposed and actual freeway routes through San Francisco even though its accompanying editorial was already chastising protestors: "The remarkable aspect of these protests and claims of injury is their tardiness. They concern projects that have for years been set forth in master plans, surveys, and expensive traffic studies. They have been ignored or overlooked by citizens and public official alike—until the time was at hand for concrete pouring and when revision had become either impossible or extremely costly. The evidence indicates that the citizenry never did know or had forgotten what freeways the planners had in mind for them."

**WE ARE ON LIFE'S STAGE EVER SO BRIEFLY** relative to the timeless beauty of the waterfront environment. It is the responsibility of each generation to protect natural assets for all.

## Howard Wong, AIA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathryn Hyde |
| **To:** | Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov |
| **Subject:** | Re: housing SF |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 6:51:15 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind

- Much of the new construction is poorly designed - i,e, Haight and Stanyan

- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like cities that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

I favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Dwyer, Debra (CPC) |
| **To:** | BOS Legislation, (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Shum, Ryan (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Letter submitted 12/1 by Lozeau Drury law firm re Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 3:27:42 PM |
| **Importance:** | High |

---

Hello,

In the Land Use committee hearing today, a speaker indicated that a letter was submitted around 12:45 pm today from the law firm Lozeau Drury regarding the environmental review for the Family Zoning Plan, files 250700 and 250701.

Please forward a copy of this letter to Planning as soon as possible - to Planning staff on this email. We need to review it before the full board hearing tomorrow, 12/2.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

Debra Dwyer

**Debra Dwyer (she/her/hers)**
**Principal Environmental Planner**
**Environmental Planning Division**
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7576 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Richard Drury |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org |
| **Subject:** | CEQA comments for Family Zoning Plan (Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985) |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 12:44:54 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.12.01.SF Rezone BOS ComLtr-PDF w exhibits.pdf |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors and Land Use and Transportation Committee:
Attached please find the comments of Neighbors United SF concerning the Family Zoning Plan, (Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985).
Thank you for considering these comments. Please include these comments in the record for this matter.
Richard Drury

--
Richard Drury
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 836-4200
richard@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL

December 1, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Land Use and Transportation Committee c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, CPC, FamilyZoningCEQA@sfgov.org

**RE: Comment on CEQA Addendum for San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan."**
**Board of Supervisors December 2, 2025.**
**Board File Nos. 250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073 and 250985**

President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing on behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, a consortium of San Francisco neighborhood and community groups representing thousands of San Francisco residents, concerning the so-called San Francisco "Family Zoning Plan" ("Rezone"). We request that the Board defer any decision on the Rezone until the City Planning Department prepares a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"). CEQA review would force the City to consider feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Rezone's impacts, and also to consider feasible alternatives, such as placing the proposed 4,000 additional units in specific locations (such as Park Merced, Stonestown, Treasure Island, Hunters Point, etc.), rather than upzoning entire swaths of the city in hopes that the 4,000 units will be built somewhere within the upzoned areas.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Rezone will forever change the face of the City. It will allow new development to accommodate 54,000 new housing units in so-called "well-resourced" areas of the City.[1] While the City prepared an environmental impact report ("EIR") for its Housing Element in 2022 (2022 EIR), the proposed Rezone is vastly different from the zoning studied in the 2022 Housing Element and its associated 2022 EIR. Nevertheless, the Planning Department proposes to rely on the 2022 EIR.

A rezoning of this magnitude requires thorough environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") so that the City's residents and decision-makers can be aware of its impacts, can consider all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, and can have a robust and open discussion prior to making irreversible changes to San Francisco's landscape for all time. The California Court of Appeal recently held that a supplemental EIR ("SEIR") is required for a general plan amendment that allows taller buildings than allowed by a prior plan (as here), and that the SEIR must analyze all of the increased impacts caused by the taller buildings. (*Save Our Access v. City of San Diego*, 2025 WL 2945714, 115 Cal.App.5th 388 (Cal. Ct. App. Oct. 17, 2025) (*Save Our Access II*); *Save Our Access v. City of San Diego*, 92 Cal.App.5th 819 (2023) (*Save Our Access I*).) Under the *Save Our Access* line of cases, an SEIR is clearly required for the Rezone since it allows vastly taller building heights, and includes different geographic areas than the 2022 Plan.

The Rezone will have myriad significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR or included in the Housing Element.

- HISTORIC RESOURCES: The Rezone, unlike the Housing Element, will allow new, high-rise development in the historic northeast neighborhoods of North Beach and the Northern Waterfront, including Fisherman's Wharf– something not allowed or analyzed the 2022 EIR or Housing Element.
- HEIGHT LIMITS INCREASED: The Rezone, unlike the Housing Element, includes amendments to base zoning and base height limits, and creating new zoning for many areas. The Rezone will allow the construction of buildings up to 350-feet taller than anything analyzed in the 2022 EIR, resulting in new wind, aesthetic, biological and shadow impacts not analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

---

[1] While the Rezone purports to address racial disparities in the City by targeting "well-resourced" areas, the Rezone seems to focus on largely Asian "well-resourced" areas, such as the Sunset District, Richmond District, and Northeast, while leaving largely untouched predominantly Caucasian "well-resourced" area such as Pacific Heights, Marina and Seacliff. As such, the Rezone may have discriminatory impacts, much like the development of the Western Addition, or the City's historic bans on wood-framed buildings that targeted Chinese-owned businesses. (See, *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 6 S. Ct. 1064, 1065, 30 L. Ed. 220 (1886).) The City should analyze the potentially racially discriminatory impacts of the Rezone.

- HOUSING SUSTAINABILITY DISTRICT: The Rezone, unlike the Housing Element, establishes a housing sustainability district.
- WIND: The Rezone will create significant new wind impacts from vastly taller buildings, while at the same time the Rezone ordinance proposes to weaken the City's wind ordinance to eliminate the requirement for mandatory wind mitigation, and to redefine significant wind impacts from 1-hour to 9-hours – all of which will conspire to create significant new wind impacts far greater than anything analyzed or contemplated in the 2022 EIR.
- DISPLACEMENT OF RENT-CONTROLLED HOUSING: The Rezone will result in the displacement of rent-controlled tenants and legacy businesses, by replacing rent-controlled and existing affordable units with luxury, high-rise condos and allowing development in the areas within the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District – something avoided in the 2022 Housing Element.
- AIR POLLUTION: The Rezone will create significant airborne cancer risks in newly identified APEZ zones (air pollutant exposure zones), and will result in criteria air pollution far above CEQA significance threshold set by the Bay Area Air District .
- SHADOW: The Rezone will create significant new shadow impacts due to much taller buildings.
- CONTAMINATED SITES: The Rezone will allow development on contaminated sites not analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- TRAFFIC: The Rezone will create new significant air quality impacts from increased vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and from construction emissions.
- SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT: The Rezone will allow development on the site of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility, which will require either a replacement facility or vast amounts of infrastructure to transport sewage to other plants.
- NORTH BEACH SUD: The Rezone will have cumulative impacts with the recent repeal of the North Beach Special Use District, which removes protections for almost all historic resources in the North Beach area.
- GREAT HIGHWAY CLOSURE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The City has failed to analyze new changed circumstances, particularly the closure of the Great Highway, which will exacerbate significant traffic and public transit impacts on the Rezone, which adds thousands of new residential units to the Sunset and Richmond neighborhoods.

It is legally improper for the City to bypass CEQA review for the Rezone. Addenda are only allowed where '(2) Only **minor technical changes** or additions are necessary to make the EIR under consideration adequate under CEQA." (CEQA Guidelines §15164, subd. (a); *Save Our Heritage Organization v. City of San Diego*, 28

Cal. App. 5th 656, 664–65 (2018) (emphasis added). The Proposed Rezone in this case allows **increased height of up to 350-feet above those analyzed in the 2022 EIR**. (Addendum No. 1 to 2022 Housing Element Environmental Impact Report, ("Addendum") at p. 11). The 2022 EIR analyzed building heights of up to 300 feet for proposed buildings, which the Rezone allows building heights of up to 500 to 650 feet – 350 feet taller than anything analyzed in the 2022 EIR. (Addendum 11). These are not "minor technical changes," but rather major substantive changes with significant environmental impacts.

For these reasons, we ask the City to prepare a Supplement EIR to analyze the Rezone, and to consider feasible mitigation measures and alternative to reduce its myriad impacts.

## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Rezone proposes to add 54,000 new housing units to San Francisco, above levels that would occur without rezoning. The City contends that the Rezone is necessary to meet state-mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals of 36,200 additional housing units. The 2022 Housing Element provided for 50,000 new units of housing, so the Rezone allows for significantly more housing – 4,000 additional units. The Rezone moves the proposed housing to different areas of the city where it will have far greater impacts to historic resources, air quality, transportation, displacement and other resources.

We are commenting on the version of the Rezone that has been provided to the public. However, we are aware that the Rezone is in a state of flux, as new amendments are being proposed on an almost daily basis. The Rezone is a moving target, which makes meaningful public comment all but impossible. "An accurate, stable and finite project description is the sine qua non of an informative and legally adequate EIR." (*County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles* (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 185, 192.) "[A] curtailed or distorted project description," on the other hand, "may stultify the objectives of the reporting process. Only through an accurate view of the project may affected outsiders and public decision-makers balance the proposal's benefit against its environmental costs, consider mitigation measures, assess the advantage of terminating the proposal (i.e., the "no project" alternative) and weigh other alternatives in the balance." (*Id.* See also, CEQA section 15124.) The City has abjectly failed to provide the public with an accurate and stable project description that would allow meaningful comment. At the very least, the City should allow a 30-day public comment period between the first reading of the Rezone Ordinance at the Board of Supervisors, anticipated to occur on December 2, 2025 and the second reading. The Project description will not be stable until the December 2, 2025 vote. This will allow a 30-day period for the public to review and comment on the stable project description.

The Project description in the 2022 EIR simply does not accurately describe the Rezone project. As such, the City may not rely on the 2022 EIR, which describes a very different Project. Some courts have allowed agencies to rely on prior EIRs when the revised project has the same footprint or the same or reduced environmental impacts.

(*Sw. Reg'l Council of Carpenters v. City of Los Angeles* (2022) 76 Cal. App. 5th 1154). However, when, as here, the project's footprint is expanded, the project's height is increased, and/or the project's impacts are increased, a supplemental EIR is required. (*Save Our Access I and II*).

The City largely ignores or mischaracterizes the Rezone's environmental impacts. For example, the Addendum does not even mention the fact that the Rezone (unlike the 2022 Housing Element) will allow redevelopment in the northeast districts of Telegraph Hill, North Beach and the Northern Waterfront, including Fisherman's Wharf. The City also ignores the fact that it has already approved 71,772 new units of housing that have yet to be built. The City' RHNA goal is 82,069. Therefore, the City only needs another 10,297 units to meet its RHNA goal – not 36,200, or 54,000.[2] Nor does the City discuss the fact that the Rezone is likely to displace low-income residents from rent-controlled units, while constructing new market-rate units without rent-control. The Rezone does not require any affordable housing and allows rent-controlled units to be replaced with luxury housing. The net result is likely to be less affordable housing – not more. The City's own calculations show that the Rezone will abjectly fail to meet RHNA's affordable housing goals.

The City fails to accurately describe the Rezone project. The City calculates that the "realistic" projected build-out as a result of the Rezone will be 54,000 additional housing units – 4,000 more than analyzed in the 2022 EIR. However, the Rezone actually creates a capacity for an additional 800,000 housing units. Full build-out would more than double the population of the City. Even the City's own calculations estimate that the Rezone could result in a range of additional housing ranging from 64,000 units (soft sites method); 39,000 units (citywide capacity method); to 19,000 units (financial feasibility method). (SF Planning Dept., Family Zoning Plan Rezoning Capacity Calculations Fact Sheet). Since the City's own staff admits that these are all realistic scenarios, a CEQA document should be prepared to compare the environmental impacts of these feasible outcomes, as well as the full build-out scenario.

The Rezone is vastly different from the Housing Element analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Supplemental CEQA review is required to analyze the impacts created by these vast changes to the Housing Element. These major modifications are discussed in the attached letter from Certified Urban Planner, Deborah Holley. (Exhibit A). Ms. Holley provides a map showing that the Rezone adds massive amounts of new development to District 3 (North Beach, Fisherman's Warf), and District 8 (Mission/Noe Valley), none of which was even mentioned in the 2022 EIR.

- The 2025 Rezone adds 6,938 parcels and 12,150 units, that were not in the 2022 Housing Element.

---

[2] Housing and Community Development barely accounted for the capacity created by the 4-plex and 6-plex legislation passed in 2023. Roughly 120,000 parcels are eligible, and even a fraction of those converting to 4–6 units would generate hundreds of thousands of potential homes.

- The Rezone increases height on 7,580 parcels and 10,009 units, above heights analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- The Rezone increases density on 16,135 parcels, with 16,135 units currently on those parcels.
- The Rezone adds 30,653 parcels with 38,692 units that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR – mostly in District 3 and District 8.
- The Rezone almost doubles the square footage of developable land, increasing the amount by 254,211,574 square feet.

The Rezone opens up thousands of rent-controlled units for high density, market rate development, virtually ensuring that thousands of low-income residents will be displaced to make way for luxury housing. The Rezone includes 3,481 two-unit rent-controlled parcels with 32,237 units, increases height on 4,345 rent-controlled parcels with 26,784 units, an increases density on 1,341 rent-controlled parcels with 20,691 units. While the Board of Supervisors is considering amendments to protect rent-controlled units with 3 or more units, this leaves about 20,564 two-unit rent-controlled units (10,282 parcels) with absolutely no protection from displacement and redevelopment.

None of these impacts were proposed, discussed or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, and must be analyzed and mitigated in a supplemental EIR.

## III. LEGAL STANDARD.

### A. CEQA Addendum (Pub. Res. Code section 21166).

The City Planning Department proposes to approve the Rezone based on an Addendum to the 2022 Housing Element EIR. This is entirely inappropriate since, as discussed above, the Rezone adds 30,653 parcels that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The proposed Rezone is vastly different from the project analyzed in the 2022 EIR, and will have significant new environmental impacts that must be analyzed in a Supplemental EIR. (SEIR).

The court of appeal has stated, "The addendum is the other side of the coin from the supplement to an EIR. This section provides an interpretation with a label and an explanation of the kind of document that does not need additional public review." "It must be remembered that an addendum is prepared where '(2) **Only minor technical changes or additions are necessary to make the EIR under consideration adequate under CEQA; and (3) The changes to the EIR made by the addendum do not raise important new issues about the significant effects on the environment.**' (CEQA Guidelines §15164 (a); *Save Our Heritage Organization v. City of San Diego*, 28 Cal. App. 5th 656, 664–65 (2018) (emphasis added).) Even a 15-foot increase in height for a residential building (increasing height from 75 feet to 90 feet) requires a supplemental EIR, not an addendum. "Accordingly, the appropriate protocol is to have the county draft and recirculate a focused supplemental EIR, limited solely to analysis of height and profile-related impacts of the medical clinic, as built and where built to a height of ninety feet." *Ventura Foothills Neighbors v. Cty. of Ventura*, 232 Cal. App. 4th 429, 434, (2014).

Section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that "the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred." Pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration is only required when:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

    (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would, in fact, be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The "fair argument" standard applies to analysis under Section 21166 when the proposed project is outside the scope of the prior EIR. As the Court of Appeal recently held:

> We similarly apply the **fair argument** test to review an agency's determination whether to prepare a **new** or **supplemental EIR** in a later **new project** following certification of a **program EIR**. [Citation.] The Legislature's use of similar language in sections 21151 and 21094 indicate "it intended to establish a similar **low threshold** for an agency's determination **whether to prepare a new EIR** on a later new project that follows certification of a program or plan EIR. In other words, **if** there is **substantial evidence** in the record that the **later project may arguably have** a **significant adverse effect** on the environment

> which was **not examined in the prior program EIR, doubts must be resolved in favor of environmental review** and the agency **must prepare** a **new tiered EIR, notwithstanding** the existence of **contrary evidence**." [Citation.]
>
> (*Save Our Access I*, 92 Cal.App.5th at 860 [citing *Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1320–1321] [emph. added].)

As the court held in *Save Our Access I*, a project that allows development of a greater height than analyzed in a prior programmatic EIR, is outside the scope of the prior EIR. (*Save Our Access I*, 92 Cal.App.5th at 845.) Therefore, the "fair argument" standard applies to subsequent projects that exceed the height limits in the program EIR. (*Id*. at 860). A project that includes geographic areas outside the scope of the prior program EIR is also subject to the fair argument standard. (*Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1320–1321). A subsequent project is not within the scope of a previous Program EIR if it is inconsistent with the plan addressed in the Program EIR. (14 CCR § 15168(c)(2); *see* PRC § 21094(b).) "**If the subsequent project is not consistent with the program or plan, it is treated as a new project and must be fully analyzed in a project—or another tiered EIR if it may have a significant effect on the environment.**" (*Friends of College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist*. (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, 960 [emph. added]; *Save Our Access I,* 92 Cal.App.5th at 845.)

Since the Rezone allows vast swaths of development outside of geographic areas analyzed in the 2022 EIR, allows building heights of up to 350 taller than analyzed in the 2022 EIR, and allows development of historic resources and contaminated sites not analyzed in the 2022 EIR, the "fair argument" standard applies to the City's use of an Addendum. Under the fair argument standard, an EIR is required if there is a "fair argument" based on substantial evidence that the project may have any significant adverse environmental impacts. Pub. Res. Code § 21080(d).

**B. SB 131.**

The Addendum briefly argues that the recently passed SB 131 applies to some, but not all, of the Rezone. (Addendum 8). SB 131 exempts from CEQA review "a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 65583 of the Government Code." The City argues that this exemption applies to all but 3.4 percent of the parcels in the Rezone, which are excluded from SB 131 as "natural and protected lands." (Addendum 8).

The City misinterprets SB 131. First, the Rezone does not implement the approved 2022 Housing Element. In fact, the Rezone is flatly inconsistent with the 2022 Housing Element. Most obviously, the 2022 Housing Element included almost no new development in the historic Northeast sector of the city (800 units), while the Rezone allows 5,900 units in that area. (Addendum 19). The 2022 Housing Element provided for negative 1,800 units in Downtown, while the Rezone placed 500 units in the Downtown area. (Id.). The Rezone placed 2,800 additional units in the Western Addition. Also, the

Rezone allows construction of buildings up to 350 taller than allowed by the Housing Element. As discussed above, the Rezone adds 30,653 parcels that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Since the Rezone is inconsistent with the 2022 Housing Element, SB 131 does not apply at all.

Second, SB 131 provides that it does not apply to "natural and protected lands," and the Rezone admittedly includes numerous parcels that meet this definition. (Pub. Res. Code § 21080.085).

> (a) This division does not apply to a rezoning that implements the schedule of actions contained in an approved housing element pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 65583 of the Government Code.
> (b) (1) Subdivision (a) does not apply to either of the following:
> (B) A rezoning that would allow for construction to occur within the boundaries of any natural and protected lands as defined pursuant to Section 21067.5.
> (2) (A) (i) Subdivision (a) applies to a rezoning that contains within its boundaries any natural and protected lands as defined pursuant to Section 21067.5 if those natural and protected lands are excluded from the rezoning.
> (ii) The definition of "natural and protected lands" described in clause (i) does not include the lands described in subdivision (p) of Section 21067.5.
> (B) The rezoning of any parcel or portions of a parcel that is excluded from a rezoning under this paragraph shall be a separate project that is subject to this division.
>
> Public Resources Code §21067.5 defines "natural and protected land" as follows:
>
> "Natural and protected lands" means sites located within any of the following locations:
> (a) The state park system, as described in Article 1 (commencing with Section 5001) of Chapter 1 of Division 5.
> …
> (i) A hazardous waste site that is listed pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code or a hazardous waste site designated by the Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Section 25356 of the Health and Safety Code, unless either of the following apply:
> (1) The site is an underground storage tank site that received a uniform closure letter issued pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code based on closure criteria established by the State Water Resources Control Board for the use proposed by the project. This paragraph does not alter or change the conditions to remove a site from the list of hazardous waste sites listed pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
> (2) The State Department of Public Health, State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, or a local agency making a determination pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code has otherwise determined that the site is suitable for the use proposed by the project.

> (j) Within a regulatory floodway as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in any official maps published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, unless the development has received a no-rise certification in accordance with Section 60.3(d)(3) of Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
> …
> (m) An environmentally sensitive area within the coastal zone, as defined in Section 30107.5…

The Addendum admits that at least 3.4 percent of the Rezone area are "natural and protected lands," within the meaning of SB 131. The Upzoning Plan includes several Cortese List contaminated sites. Several of these sites are "active," meaning that they have not be remediated. We have retained a hazardous materials expert to identify all of the Cortese List sites covered by the Upzoning. But we have already identified at least nine active Cortese List sites in our informal review, including 1100 JUNIPERO SERRA BLVD; and 300 W PORTAL AVE. The Rezone also includes parcels in listed flood zones. The Rezone also includes environmentally sensitive areas in the Coastal zone. These areas are expressly excluded from SB 131 and render the entire Rezone project ineligible for an SB 131 exemption.[3]

## IV. CEQA ANALYSIS.

### A. HISTORIC RESOURCES.

The Rezone will have significant historic resources impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR found significant and unmitigated impacts to historic resources, (Addendum 60), but the Rezone's impacts are far greater and also significant and unmitigated. (Addendum 61). Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).)

---

[3] The Addendum suggests that it can review the Rezone using a hybrid approach – reviewing the natural and protected lands under CEQA section 21166, and the remainder of the Project under SB 131. However, CEQA prohibits such a schizophrenic analysis. Under CEQA, the agency must review the "whole of the action" in a single document. A "project" is "the whole of an action" directly undertaken, supported, or authorized by a public agency "which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable ***indirect*** physical change in the environment." (PRC § 21065; CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR § 15378(a).) A public agency is not permitted to subdivide a single project into smaller individual subprojects in order to avoid the responsibility of considering the environmental impact of the project as a whole. "The requirements of CEQA, 'cannot be avoided by chopping up proposed projects into bite-size pieces which, individually considered, might be found to have no significant effect on the environment or to be only ministerial.' [Citation.]" (*Topanga Beach Renters Assn.* v. *Department of General Services* (1976) 58 Cal.App.3d 188, 195-196 [129 Cal.Rptr. 739].)

We submit herewith the comments of Architectural Historian Bridget Maley, former President of the San Francisco Landmarks Advisory Board. (Exhibit B). She states:

> The Rezone would result in a myriad of significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR or included in the Housing Element, not the least of which are impacts to historic resources. The Rezone will have significant historic resources impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR found significant and unmitigated impacts to historic resources, but the Rezone's impacts are far greater, with significant and unmitigated impacts. Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).)
>
> The Rezone allows high-rise development on, near, or within areas that contain historic resources. Many of these areas were not included for development in the 2022 Housing Element, and the impacts of this potential development on historic resources was not analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
>
> Further, the Rezone includes the following language related to Bonuses for "Historic Preservation." However, these bonuses, as shown below, encourage height increases, facadism, and other over-scaled additions that would result in diminished historic fabric and result in unintended impacts to historic resources. Additionally, this proposed legislation added at the last minute in the September 11, 2025 version of the legislation, and has not been evaluated in the Addendum or in a SEIR.
>
> (Maley at 2-3).

Maley goes on to discuss provisions of the Rezone that encourage development of historic buildings. She states, "This late addition to the legislation has the great potential to cause impacts to historic resources, instead of preserving them, as it would allow large sections of historic buildings to be demolished and over scaled additions and height increases to be implemented as bonuses. For the reasons listed above, it is my professional opinion that the Rezone, if approved, would have potentially significant environmental impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") through a full recirculated SEIR." (Id. at 4).

The 2022 EIR assumed that historic buildings (Category A resources) would not be redeveloped for housing. (2022 EIR, App. C, pp. 10, 17). The 2022 EIR stated, "The department's housing growth projection factored in the locations of known historic districts in San Francisco and assumed that future development would primarily occur outside those districts." (2022 EIR p. 4.2-82). The HE EIR conceded that its "analysis cannot anticipate the exact manner in which future construction may be designed or whether such projects will propose altering or demolishing historic resources." (2022 EIR p. 4.2-85.) The 2022 EIR stated:

> The representative pattern of growth depicted in the department's projection of future housing units under the Housing Element 2022 Update takes into account

> the presence of individual built-environment historic resources and historic districts identified as of 2021 (including resources designated or found eligible for listing in local, state, and federal historic resource registers). Specifically, the projection assumes future housing construction would be less likely to occur on parcels that currently contain Category A resources (i.e., properties that are already known to qualify as historic resources)... This assumption reflects that Category A resource status would act as a development constraint for future housing development construction. Additionally, the planning department did not increase height limits in historic districts identified in [the Planning Code]. (2022 EIR, App. C, pp. 10, 17.)

However, the Rezone now identifies numerous historic resources for upzoning for residential development, contrary to the analysis in the 2022 EIR.

The 2022 EIR concluded that any impacts to historic resources would be significant even after mitigation. By increasing impacts to historic resource, the 2025 Rezone will have "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," and a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).) The 2022 EIR concluded that even with the implementation of mitigation, impacts to "project-level and cumulative: built-environment historic resources" would be significant and unmitigated. (2022 EIR p. S-4.) "Because demolition of built-environment historic resources or alteration in an adverse manner could still occur, the impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation." (2022 EIR, p. 4.2-100.)

In *Communities for a Better Environ. v. Calif. Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98 at 122-125 (*CBE v. CRA*), the court held that when a "first tier" EIR admits a significant, unavoidable environmental impact, a lead agency must prepare second tier EIRs for later projects to ensure that those unmitigated impacts are "mitigated or avoided." (Id.) The court reasoned that the unmitigated impacts were not "adequately addressed" in the first tier EIR since they were not "mitigated or avoided." (Id.) Thus, significant effects disclosed in first tier EIRs will trigger second tier EIRs unless such effects have been "adequately addressed," in a way that ensures the effects will be "mitigated or avoided." (Id.) Such a second tier EIR is required even if the impact still cannot be fully mitigated and a statement of overriding considerations will be required. The court explained, "The requirement of a statement of overriding considerations is central to CEQA's role as a public accountability statute; it requires public officials, in approving environmentally detrimental projects, to justify their decisions based on counterbalancing social, economic or other benefits, and to point to substantial evidence in support." (Id. at 124-125.) Since the 2022 EIR determined that impacts to historic resources would be significant and unmitigated, supplemental CEQA review is required for the 2025 Rezone, which increases impacts to historic resources.

The Rezone allows high-rise development in the Northeast Sector of the City, including in the historic district of North Beach. These areas were not included for development in the 2022 Housing Element, and the impacts of this development on historic resources was not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. By moving over 5000 units of new housing to this area, the Rezone exacerbates the impact on historic resources. Since this

is “one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR,” (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)(A)), a supplemental EIR is required to analyze and mitigate this impact. Since this impact is beyond the scope of the 2022 EIR, it is subject to the fair argument standard.

The Housing Element EIR Addendum fails to analyze impacts of additional height and density increases, as well as changes in zoning use districts, on designated historic resources or historic districts or areas with known concentrations of “A” rated historic resources, but not yet designated as historic districts. Bridget Maley’s letter includes a listing of historic resources adversely affected by the Rezone. Impacts to these historic resources were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR and must be analyzed in a Supplemental EIR. That list included herein by reference. It includes, but is not limited to:

- Fully documented North Beach National Register Historic District submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office and awaiting hearing by the State Historical Resource Commission was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR .The Rezone could have significant impacts to this identified historic district, including heights rezoned from 40 feet to 50 feet in block Block 0076.
- Designated Northeast Waterfront Article 10 Historic District.
- Eligible Washington Square Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Eligible Upper Grant Avenue Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR .
- Designated Otis Elevator Company National Register No. 99001265 (1 Beach Street; Parcel 0018/001).
- Designated Grabhorn Press Building National Register No. 97000349 (1335 Sutter Street; Parcel 0690/012A).
- Designated Thomas Payne House National Register No. 80000847 (1409 Sutter Street; Parcel 0689/025). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet.
- Designated Washington Square Article 10 Landmark No. 226 ( 1651 Stockton Street and Filbert Street; 0102/022001) . The parcels on the northern edge of Washington Square are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR . This could result in significant impacts to this park.
- Temple Sherith Israel National Register #10000114 (2266 California St., Parcel 0637/011).

- Designated Cable Car National Register Historic District No. 66000233. The Cable Car lines located within areas being upzoned and/or density decontrolled by the Upzone Plan could be significantly impacted.
- Designated Grace Cathedral Article 10 Landmark No. 170 (1100 California Street; Parcel 0246/001). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Old Flood Mansion, Pacific Union Club, both Article 10 Landmark No. 64 and National Register No. 66000230 (1000 California Street; Parcel 0245/001).
- Historic Category "A" rated buildings across the city would be impacted by the Rezone as it affords no protection for these previously identified but not designated historic resources. The City of San Francisco Planning Department has previously required full Historic Resource Evaluations for projects involving Category "A" rated buildings. This policy change was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Casebolt House Article 10 Landmark No 51 (2727 Pierce Street, Parcel 0560/005). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Spreckels Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 197 (2080 Washington Street, Parcel 0601/005. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Haas-Lilienthal House Article 10 Landmark No. 69 and National Register No 730000438 (2007 Franklin St. 0600/002). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Sacred Heart Parish Complex Article 10 Landmark No.316 and National Register 10000112 (660 Oak Street, Parcel 0828/012; 735 Fell Street, Parcel 0828/022A; 554 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/22; and 546-548 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/21). The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Many other historic buildings listed in letter of Bridget Maley.

## B. HEIGHT AND RELATED IMPACTS.

The Rezone will allow construction of buildings up to 350-feet taller than analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The 2022 EIR analyzed building height ranging from 55 feet to 300 feet high. (Addendum 11). The Rezone allows building heights up to 500 feet high, and up to 650 feet high in two areas. (Addendum 11). These taller buildings are beyond the scope of the 2022 EIR, triggering the fair argument standard of review, as in the *Save Our Access* cases, discussed above. As the court of appeal held in *Save Our Access II*, supplemental CEQA review is required to analyze all of the impacts stemming from the greater building heights allowed by the Rezone.

**1. Biological Impacts.**

The Addendum admits that taller buildings may have biological impacts by obstructing flight paths of birds and impacting movement of special status species. (Addendum 48-49). The 2022 EIR found biological impacts to be less than significant. Since the Rezone will have significant biological impacts, the project will have "one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)(A),) and a supplemental EIR is required.

The 2022 EIR did not analyze biological impacts since it found the impact to be less than significant. (2022 EIR, p. 4.1-1.) Since the EIR found biological impacts to be less than significant, it imposed no mitigation measures. (2022 EIR, p. 4.1-149.) Since biological impacts were not examined as significant effects in the 2022 EIR, CEQA review is now mandated because the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration. (CEQA Guildelines 15163(a)(3)(A)).

Expert wildlife biologist Dr. Smallwood, Ph.D., concludes that the 2025 Rezone will have significant biological impacts not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. (Exhibit C). Dr. Smallwood concludes that by adding 4,000 additional residential units, changing the spatial distribution of the buildings, and increasing building heights, that the Rezone will have greater impacts on birds than the 2022 Plan. In particular, he concludes that the Rezone will have greater impacts on bird-window collisions, and that these impacts will not be adequately mitigated by the City's bird-safe window requirements. (Smallwood at 2-3). Dr. Smallwood states, "the additional 4,000 residential units could result in very large numbers of collision fatalities despite implementation of the City's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings." (Id. at 3).

Dr. Smallwood notes that San Francisco includes areas in the Pacific Flyway and areas that are rich in biological diversity. He states, "San Francisco is situated within the Pacific Flyway, which is one of the most intensely used bird migration pathways in the world." (Id. at 13). He states that "there are 147 special-status species of wildlife documented near enough to the project site to warrant a closer look at their occurrence likelihoods for the purpose of predicting potential project impacts." (Id.at 3). Dr. Smallwood concludes that the 2025 Rezone will result in 7,095 additional bird fatalities each year compared to the 2022 Plan, to a 95% confidence level. (Id. at 12). Dr. Smallwood concludes:

> Nearly all predicted deaths would be of birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and under the California Migratory Bird Protection Act, thus causing significant impacts. Given the predicted level of bird-window collision mortality, it is my opinion that the proposed project would result in potentially significant adverse biological impacts, including the unmitigated take of aerial habitats of birds, bats and other volant wildlife. Not only would the project take habitat of rare and sensitive species of birds, but it would transform the building's airspace into a lethal collision trap to birds. (Id. at 13).

Dr. Smallwood concludes that CEQA review is required to analyze patterns of bird movement through the City and to propose feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid impacts. (Id. at 17).

**2. Wind.**

The 2022 EIR concluded that the Housing Element would have significant and unmitigated wind impacts. (Addendum 99). The 2022 EIR did not analyze the impacts of the taller buildings allowed in the 2025 Rezone. The 2022 EIR assumed that projects would "stay within existing height limits." (2022 EIR, App. C, p. 17, 3.)

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will have significant unmitigated wind impacts. (Addendum 108). It concluded that buildings over 85-feet tall would have significant wind impacts. (Addendum 104). The Rezone will add taller buildings over 85-feet to more areas of the City, resulting in much greater wind impacts. Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)(B)), a supplemental EIR is required.

The Rezone allows buildings of up to 650-feet tall in certain areas. It allows increased heights along Market Street between Castro and Van Ness. Up to 160 feet. (Addendum 100). The Rezone allows 85-feet heights along Geary, and up to 300 feet at Geary and Masonic. (Addendum 101). The height difference between the rezoned blocks and the surrounding blocks with low heights would result in wind speeds that would likely exceed the hazard criteria. (Addendum 102).

The 2022 EIR stated, "Wind impacts are generally caused by large building masses that are substantially taller than their surroundings." (2022 EIR, p. 4.7-2.) The 2022 EIR states, "All projects greater than 85 feet In height would require a screening-level assessment conducted by a qualified wind expert in consultation with the department to determine their potential to result in a new wind hazard exceedance or aggravate an existing pedestrian-level wind hazard exceedance defined as the one-hour wind hazard criterion with a 26 mph equivalent wind speed." (2022 EIR, p. 4.7-11.) Since the Rezone will allow much taller buildings, well over 85-feet tall and up to 650-feet tall, it will have significant wind impacts under the standards set forth in the 2022 EIR, and an SEIR is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts.

The Rezone includes a change to the City's wind ordinance that requires CEQA review for buildings over 85 feet. The Rezone proposes to change the hazard criterion such that proposed development must not create any net new exceedance of 26 MPH wind speed for nine hours or more in a year, rather than one hour. (Addendum 104). In other words, after the Rezone, a building may cause hazardous wind conditions for a full workday, which is not currently allowed. The Rezone also eliminates an existing code requirement for "landscaping and/or wind baffling measure shall be installed on the windward side .. of the areas of concern.:" (Addendum 109).

By allowing vastly greater building heights, and eliminating previously existing mitigation standards and mitigation measures, the Rezone will have much greater wind

impacts that were never analyzed in the 2022 EIR. A supplemental EIR is required to analyze these wind impacts because "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(B)), and "Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative." (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(D)).

**3. Shadow.**

The vastly taller buildings allowed by the Rezone will have significant shadow impacts exceeding the City's CEQA significance thresholds. The 2022 Housing Element had significant unmitigated shadow impacts on Duboce Park, Larsen Playgrond, and Laurel Hill Playground.(Addendum 110-111). The Rezone creates new significant unmitigated shadow impacts on public parks including but not limited to, Noe Valley Town Square and Helen Wills Park, (Addendum 111, 113, 119) and on other parks and open spaces in areas added by the Rezone to the Northeast District including Washington Square, Joe DiMaggio Playground, and Levi Plazza Park. A supplemental EIR is required to analyze these impacts because "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(B))

We submit herewith the analysis of shadow expert Adam Noble of the consulting firm FastCast. (Exhibit D). Mr. Noble concludes that the Rezone will result in net new shadow impacts on Joe DiMaggio Playground not analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This is a zero-tolerance park, not allowed to have any additional shadow under CEQA and Measure M (Planning Code Section 295). Mr. Noble's analysis shows that on certain periods of the year and times of day, the Rezone will more than double the amount of shadow on Joe DiMaggio Park.

The City contends that a project that adds new shadow to sidewalks or a publicly accessible open space (whether subject to Section 295 or not) does not necessarily result in a significant impact under CEQA. The shadow impact analysis described in the city's Initial Study CEQA Checklist examines whether a project would "***create new shadow that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces***".

Under planning code section 295 and the joint Planning Commission/Recreation and Park Commission criterion, the impact of any amount of shadow cast by a project on public parks, open spaces, or recreational facilities under the jurisdiction of SFRPD would be considered "significant" if it would affect a facility with an established quantitative limit.

Joe DiMaggio Playground has an established quantitative limit of zero, and as detailed below, the proposed rezoning would have a net increase in shadow cast on the playground, and would therefore, result in a significant impact.

In assessing impacts per the City's CEQA significance criterion, the environmental review requires evaluation of quantitative and qualitative factors but requires ***use and enjoyment of the park or public space to be substantially and adversely affected for the impact to be "significant."*** Therefore, the City contends that in certain situations, new shadow effects on an open space might not be a significant environmental impact under CEQA but could be found to be significant under planning code section 295. (Housing Element EIR p 4.8-17)[4]

Because Joe DiMaggio playground is heavily used throughout all periods of the day throughout the year by residents from the neighborhood and nearby neighborhoods, as well as schools for P.E. classes, the additional shadow would adversely and substantially impact the use and enjoyment of the park.

As detailed in Mr. Noble's analysis, this would be particularly true for fall periods when shadow impacts would be the most significant and lower temperatures create a greater need for sunlight to be able to enjoy the park.

**C. DISPLACEMENT.**

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will result in displacement of low-income residents, small businesses, and legacy businesses. (Addendum 37-38). The Addendum states, "new market-rate housing development may contribute to indirect displacement of lower-income communities in San Francisco." (Addendum 37). It continues, "there could be a connection between market rate housing development and displacement." (Addendum 38). By allowing more market rate housing in the Rezone than in the 2022

---

[4] Commenter disputes the City's shadow impacts methodology because it conflicts with well-established court of appeal precedent. Where a local or regional policy of general applicability, such as an ordinance, is adopted in order to avoid or mitigate environmental effects, a conflict with that policy in itself indicates a potentially significant impact on the environment. (*Pocket Protectors v. Sacramento* (2005) 124 Cal.App.4th 903.) Indeed, any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable plans must be discussed in an EIR. (14 CCR § 15125(d); *City of Long Beach v. Los Angeles Unif. School Dist.* (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 889, 918*; Friends of the Eel River v. Sonoma County Water* Agency (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859, 874 (EIR inadequate when Lead Agency failed to identify relationship of project to relevant local plans).) A Project's inconsistencies with local plans and policies constitute significant impacts under CEQA. (*Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 783-4; *Georgetown Preservation Society v. County of El Dorado* (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 358.) Since the Rezone Project has significant impacts under Prop M (Section 295), it also has significant impacts under CEQA. However, because the Rezone Project has significant shadow impacts even under the City's improperly narrow interpretation of the law, the issue is moot.

Housing Element, this displacement impact will be exacerbated. According to an economic analysis prepared by the San Francisco Office of the Controller, as a result of Rezone 500 to 1,000 additional units would be demolished over 20 years. Many of these units will be rent-controlled (pre-1979) units since these properties will have the lowest land value. This is very different than the 2022 Housing Element, which avoided Priority Equity Geographies (PEGs), where lower income residents live. By contrast, the Rezone includes large PEG areas, where displacement is inevitable.

While the Supervisors are considering measures to provide some protection for rent-controlled properties with 3 or more units, this does nothing to protect the thousands of duplex rent-controlled properties found throughout the Richmond and Sunset Districts and elsewhere in the City. Ms. Holley calculates that the Rezone will affect 3,838 2-unit rent-controlled parcels with 7,676 rent-controlled units. Holley states (Exhibit A):

> under the rezoning, there are a significant number of two-unit rent-controlled buildings on parcels with an existing height limit of 40 feet that would be rezoned to allow heights of 50', 65' and 85', and would no longer require setbacks, creating greater incentives and likelihood that they would be redeveloped under the proposed rezoning.

Also, the Rezone allows increased development in North Beach and the Western Addition (Addendum 19), which include high levels of rent-controlled units and Priority Equity Geographies, which were excluded from development in the 2022 Housing Element. San Francisco Planning Code states that "The Priority Equity Geographies SUD is comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations" and that the 2022 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan ((2022 Housing Element) identifies them as "areas…where zoning changes must be tailored to serve the specific needs of the communities that live there; and where programs that stabilize communities and meet community needs need to be prioritized."

The Rezone shifts 5,100 units of housing to the Northeast District, (Addendum 19) which is home to the highest percentage of rent-controlled units in the City. The Rezone adds 939 parcels in PEG areas, with 2,321 units, including 70 two-unit rent-controlled buildings with 140 units.

Urban Planner Deborah Holley states, "The inclusion of parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR."

Allowing this development and displacement in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD is flatly inconsistent with the 2022 EIR and the 2022 Plan since the stated purpose of the 2022 Plan was to focus development on "well-resourced areas" and away from Priority Equity Geographies. The 2025 Rezone does the exact opposite of the stated goal of the 2022 Plan, which is an obvious inconsistency requiring supplemental CEQA review.

Ms. Holley also points out that the Rezone for the first time adds Laguna Honda Hospital. Redevelopment of this parcel would result in massive displacement. Ms. Holley

states, "The 62-acre Laguna Honda hospital and rehabilitation center located 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard was added to the rezoning plan, and if redeveloped would result in significant displacement impacts for the long-term nursing home residents. Laguna Honda has 769 beds and offers short-term rehab and long-term nursing care…The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' which covers the majority of the 62 acres under existing height limits, to 85' for the entire site, and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing."

Displacement is an environmental issue under CEQA. (*Save Berkeley Neighborhoods v. Regents* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th 226, 233 (displacement of tenants is a CEQA impact)). CEQA requires the lead agency to determine whether the "environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly," (PRC § 21083(b)(3), (d)). CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XII provides that a project will have significant impacts where it will:

- Induce substantial population growth or concentration of population in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new housing or businesses), or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. See CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XII.

The Addendum suggests vague mitigation measures such as "advancing equitable housing access, promoting racial and social equity, and eliminating displacement with strategies such as tenant protections, preservation of affordability, production of affordable housing, and advancing equitable access to housing resources and affordable units." However, these are vague and unenforceable measures. The Addendum fails to propose any binding and enforceable mitigation measures, such as requiring the mandatory construction of affordable housing, requiring payment for the construction of affordable housing, or requiring public lands to be used for 100% affordable housing. In fact, the city is reversing or weakening all of these requirements. The 2025 Rezone requires absolutely no affordable housing.

A public agency may not rely on mitigation measures of uncertain efficacy or feasibility. (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 727.) "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors. (14 CCR § 15364.) Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements or other legally binding instruments. (14 CCR § 15126.4(a)(2).) In fact, proposals to provide benefits to legacy businesses, may not be legally allowable, let alone, legally enforceable. (*City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson* (1980) 27 Cal.3d 123, 134.)

The Rezone is reminiscent of the City's "urban renewal" of the Western Addition in the 1960s and 1970s, which wiped out what was at that time one of the most ethnically diverse communities in the United States and displaced much of the City's African-American community. Like the current "Family Zoning Plan," the urban renewal of the Western Addition was justified by the alleged need for more affordable housing. However, to make way for the new housing, the City destroyed a thriving African-American, Latino and Asian-American community, which never fully recovered, and the new housing was occupied largely by wealthier, white residents. The main difference is that the 2025 Family Zoning Plan is now targeting the City's Chinese Community, in the Richmond and Sunset Districts, which will undoubtedly face widescale displacement under the Rezone. This form of "White Urbanism" is now well-documented. (See, e.g,, Goetz, Whiteness and Urban Planning, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol 86 (2020).)

The Federal Reserve Bank has concluded that supply-side constraints such as zoning and environmental regulation have absolutely no impact on housing costs. The single most significant factors driving high housing costs are extreme wealth disparities, and remote work. (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, J. Mondragon, Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities (2025), https://www.frbsf.org/research-and-insights/publications/working-papers/2025/03/supply-constraints-do-not-explain-house-price-and-quantity-growth-across-u-s-cities/); Federal Reserve Bank, J. Mondragon, Housing Demand and Remote Work (2025), https://www.nber.org/papers/w30041). Building more luxury housing does not decrease housing costs and in fact often leads to gentrification of previously affordable neighborhoods. Trickle-down economics did not work in the Reagan Administration and it will not work now.

Since the Rezone will displace both existing housing and people, it will have a significant impact that must be analyzed in a supplemental EIR. The SEIR must consider mitigation measures and feasible alternatives to reduce this impact.

## D. AIR QUALITY AND CANCER RISK.

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will create significant air quality impacts, including additional cancer risk from fine particulate matter, known as PM-2.5. (Addendum 95). The Housing Element EIR admitted significant unmitigated PM-2.5 cancer risk (Addendum 90), but the Rezone will have even greater air quality and cancer risks since it allows more development and taller buildings, and will result in more vehicle miles traveled (VMT). (Addendum 90, 92-93).

The 2022 EIR concluded that buildings under 240-feet and 495 units would have less than significant construction air quality impacts. (Addendum 89). Taller buildings have significant PM-2.5 and nitrogen oxide impacts. (Addendum 94). But allowing taller and larger buildings, the Rezone will create more significant construction air quality impacts, including emissions of cancer-cause PM-2.5. The Rezone will have significant unmitigated cancer risk from PM-2.5 and the Rezone will change the distribution of those risks compared to the Housing Element. (Addendum 95).

The 2022 EIR concluded that even with the implementation of mitigation, air quality impacts would be significant and unmitigated. (2022 EIR, p. S-4, 4.6-56, 4,6-70.) By adding another 4,000 housing units, the 2025 Rezone will have "Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR." (CEQA Guidelines §15164(a)(3)(B).)

Attached hereto are the comments of Dr. Paul Rosenfeld and Matthew Hagemann, P.G., C. Hg., of the environmental consulting firm Soil, Water, Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE). (Exhibit E). SWAPE notes that the Addendum erroneously states, "The proposed rezoning program and subsequent development is expected to result in the same significant criteria air pollutant impacts from construction but not substantially more severe impacts than those disclosed in the EIR" (Addendum 93). However, SWAPE points out that by adding 4,000 additional residential units, the Rezone vastly exceeds air quality significance threshold set by the Bay Area Air District ("BAAD").

The Bay Area Air District has published screening thresholds to determine whether proposed projects will have significant impacts to air quality. (https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-4-screening_final-pdf.pdf?rev=ac551d35a52d479dad475e7d4c57afa6&sc_lang=en) Under the official BAAQMD thresholds, construction of 416 apartments is expected to have significant air quality impacts from the construction phase, and 638 apartments are expected to have significant operational air quality impacts. The addition of 4,000 residential units will vastly exceed these significance thresholds, and will therefore have a significant impacts on air quality that must be analyzed under CEQA. (SWAPE at 4).

SWAPE calculates that the additional 4,000 units of housing will create emissions of Reactive Organic Gases (ROGs) of 148 pounds per day (ppd) for the construction phase (far above the CEQA significance threshold of 54 ppd) and 145 ppd of operation ROG emissions (far above the CEQA significance threshold of 54 ppd). (SWAPE at 5). SWAPE concludes, "This finding indicates a potentially significant air quality impact that the Addendum did not identify or address. In our opinion, a subsequent EIR should be conducted to provide a more substantial calculation of the Project's emissions and a more detailed evaluation of the Project's potential air quality impacts." (SWAPE at 5).

When a project exceeds an Air District CEQA significance threshold, as here, this alone establishes substantial evidence that the project will have a significant adverse environmental impact. Indeed, in many instances, such air quality thresholds are the only criteria reviewed and treated as dispositive in evaluating the significance of a project's air quality impacts. (See, e.g. *Schenck v. County of Sonoma* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 949, 960 [County applies Air District's "published CEQA quantitative criteria" and "threshold level of cumulative significance"]; see also *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 110-11 ["A 'threshold of significance' for a given environmental effect is simply that level at which the lead agency finds the effects of the project to be significant"].) The California Supreme Court has shown the importance an air district significance threshold has in providing substantial

evidence of a significant adverse impact. (*Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist*. (2010) 48 Cal.4th 310, 327 [estimated emissions in excess of air district's significance thresholds "constitute substantial evidence supporting a fair argument for a significant adverse impact"].)

Also, in 2025 city released a new APEZ (air pollutant exposure zone) map showing areas with high cancer risk. The Rezone allows development in some of these newly identified areas. This is a significant new information and a changed circumstance that was not known at the time of the 2022 EIR. (Addendum 95). The new APEZ areas include Sunset Blvd, and Lake Merced. These areas will receive significant development under the Rezone. This impact must be analyzed. (Addendum 96). The Addendum admits that the cancer risks created by the Rezone in the new APEZ areas are significant and unmitigated. (Addendum 97). The Northeast District is within the APEZ area. By moving over 5000 units of new housing to this area, the Rezone exacerbates cancer risks from airborne pollutants.

A supplemental EIR is required because "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR." (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3)(B).) Also, the new APEZ map constitutes, "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete." (CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3).)

SWAPE states,

> The Addendum proposes development in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, which have areas within the City's air pollutant exposure zones ("APEZ"). The Addendum states that "the proposed rezoning program may result in a small proportion of additional rezoned parcels being in the APEZ, which could increase the number of people exposed to the generally high pollutant concentrations in the APEZ" (p. 97).
>
> In 2025, the City identified new APEZ areas, defined as locations "where particulate matter (PM2.5) is greater than or equal to 9 µg/m3 or where the risk of cancer from air pollutants is greater than or equal to 100 in a million." (SWAPE at 5).

The Addendum concludes that this impact is "significant and unavoidable." (Addendum 97). SWAPE disagrees with this conclusion and proposes numerous feasible mitigation measures to reduce air pollution impacts that should be analyzed in a supplemental EIR. (SWAPE at 7-9). Among the mitigation measures suggested by SWAPE are requiring the use of ultra-low VOC paints, advanced air filtration units, emissions controls on backup generators, and many other measures. These mitigation measures should all be analyzed and imposed through a supplemental EIR process.

**E. TRANSIT DELAY.**

The Addendum admits that the Rezone will create significant impacts related to public transit delay, particularly along the busy 19th Avenue corridor, and on the 38-Geary and 19-Polk lines. (Addendum 71, 78, 84). The Addendum concludes that Rezone would contribute considerably to significant and unavoidable bus loading impacts. (Addendum 84). These impacts, particularly along the 19th Avenue corridor, will be exacerbated by the recent closure of the Great Highway, which has caused congestion on 19th Avenue by closing a major thoroughfare in the Western side of the City. The closure of the Great Highway is a changed circumstance that was unknown at the time of the 2022 EIR.

A supplemental EIR is required because "substantial changes [have] occur[ed] with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects." (CEQA Guidelines §15162(a)(2).) The closure of the Great Highway is clearly a significant changed circumstance that was not analyzed in the 2022 EIR and that will impact the Transportation analysis for the Rezone.

**F. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

The Rezone will allow residential development on the site of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility. This site was not slated for development in the 2022 Plan. This amendment will require either a replacement facility or vast amounts of infrastructure to transport sewage to other plants. The sewage currently treated by the North Point Plant must go somewhere. Urban Planner Deborah Holley states, "This City-owned and -operated sewage treatment plant is one of three facilities in San Francisco that treats wastewater. It is only active during wet weather and treats up to 150 million gallons a day (MGD) during rainstorms, or 26 percent of the wastewater treated on a rainy day." She continues, "The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of this treatment plant with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' to 85' and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional. There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development at this location. Since it is inconceivable that a developer would build housing on top of a sewage treatment plant, the City needs to analyze the impacts associated with elimination of the sewage treatment plant." Ms. Holley states:

> Elimination of the sewage treatment plant would result in reduced sewage treatment capacity during wet weather. This would require (a) the construction of a new sewage treatment facility in this area of the city, or (b) the construction of new infrastructure to convey wastewater from the northeast quadrant of the city to the Oceanside Treatment Plant or the Southeast Treatment Plant in Bayview/Hunters

Point and expansion of one of these facilities to expand the treatment capacity by 150 MGD to compensate for the loss of the North Point facility.

The potential public health and hazardous materials impacts of redeveloping the site with housing must be identified and analyzed and mitigation measures must be identified in a supplemental EIR. This includes but would not be limited to testing and classification of contaminants, calculations of health risk, specific remediation measures, associated secondary impacts due to the excavation of contaminated soil, transportation and disposal of infrastructure, and treatment and disposal of contaminated water and soil.

CEQA does not allow the City to defer analysis of obvious sewage treatment needs. When a project will require construction of additional sewage treatment infrastructure, the CEQA document must analyze and mitigate the impacts of that necessary new construction. (*Sundstrom v. Cnty. of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 296; *San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Ctr. v. Cnty. of Stanislaus* (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 713 (EIR was also inadequate with respect to project description by its lack of reference to wastewater treatment plant which was necessary element of project).)

## V. GENERAL PLAN ANALYSIS.

The Rezone is legally prohibited because it is inconsistent with the General Plan. "The Legislature has mandated that every county and city must adopt a 'comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city, and of any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency's judgment bears relation to its planning.'" (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Sups*. (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 570 (quoting Gov. Code §65300).) The Supreme Court has described the general plan as "the constitution for all future developments within the city or county." *Id*. (internal quotation marks omitted). The "propriety of virtually any local decision affecting land use and development depends upon consistency with the applicable general plan and its elements." (*Id. DeVita v. Cty. of Napa*, 9 Cal. 4th 763, 803 (1995).) The "propriety of virtually any local decision affecting land use and development depends upon consistency with the applicable general plan and its elements." (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Sups.* (1990) 52 C.3d 553, 570.)

The Rezone is flatly inconsistent with the adopted General Plan, and its adopted Housing Element. The Rezone allows development in historic districts, such as North Beach and Telegraph Hill, which were protected from development in the General Plan. The Rezone allows development in Priority Equity Geographies that were protected from development in the General Plan. The Rezone allows building heights and density throughout the City that vastly exceed limits set forth in the General Plan. As such, the Rezone is legally prohibited unless and until the City amends its General Plan.

In addition, each of these General Plan inconsistencies is a significant impact that must be analyzed in an EIR. Any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable plans must be discussed in an EIR. (14 CCR § 15125(d); *City of Long Beach v. Los Angeles Unif. School Dist*. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 889, 918; *Friends of the Eel*

*River v. Sonoma County Water Agency* (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859, 874 (EIR inadequate when Lead Agency failed to identify relationship of project to relevant local plans).) A Project's inconsistencies with local plans and policies constitute significant impacts under CEQA. (*Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 783-4.)

## VI. CONCLUSION.

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission direct the Planning Staff to prepare a Supplement EIR to analyze the Rezone and to consider feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce its significant environmental impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR for the Housing Element. We further request that the Planning Commission conclude that the Rezone is prohibited since it is inconsistent with the City's General Plan.

Sincerely,



Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

# EXHIBIT A

December 1, 2025

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA  94612

**RE: Adequacy of the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR Addendum**

Dear Mr. Drury,

The San Francisco Planning Department published an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2022 Housing Element ("Housing Element FEIR") on September 3, 2025, stating that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review was required for the Family Housing Rezoning Program ("proposed rezoning program, Family Zoning Plan, FZP, rezoning plan").

Because there are potential new or more severe environmental impacts that would result from the proposed rezoning program that were not identified and analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, a supplemental EIR should have been prepared instead of an Addendum.

Such impacts include, but are not limited to the following:

A. The rezoning plan would result in new impacts associated with the potential redevelopment of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility which was not included and therefore not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR but which, as a result of the rezoning plan, is now designated as a site for the development of housing.

B. The rezoning plan would result in more severe displacement impacts, particularly those associated with the addition of numerous parcels within the Priority Equity Geographies SUD that were added to the rezoning plan but not included, and therefore not analyzed, in the Housing Element FEIR.

My qualifications for preparing this analysis include over 25 years of professional experience in land use and environmental planning, including the management and preparation of CEQA documents, and a Master of Science degree in Urban Planning

from Columbia University. My resume can be accessed via this link: https://www.holleyconsulting.com/resume/.

The Addendum to the Housing Element FEIR maintains that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required for the proposed rezoning program because the environmental impacts were adequately identified and analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, and the rezoning program "…would not result in any new or more severe environmental impacts than were identified previously."

Specifically, the Addendum states that "…no additional environmental review is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guideline Sections 15162-15164 for the following reasons:

(1) the Family Housing Rezoning Program would not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Housing Element EIR;
(2) no substantial changes have occurred that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Housing Element EIR; and
(3) no new information of substantial importance has become available which would indicate that (i) the Family Housing Rezoning Program will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR; (ii) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible, or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Housing Element EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment."

**2022 FEIR compared to Proposed Rezoning**

***Baseline Map***. In order to understand what was analyzed in the 2022 FEIR, and what was added in subsequent policy changes, I reconstructed "Figure 2-7 Projected Heights and Density Controls Under the Proposed Action" from page 2-25 of Vol. 1 of the FEIR. ***Figure 1***, below, provides the most detailed description of the parcel-level impacts of the proposed rezoning for parcels analyzed in the 2022 Final EIR.




**Figure 1. Baseline Map: 2022 FER Map Compared to the September 2025 Map, plus removing 3-unit+ Rent-Controlled Buildings and Hotels**

The September 2025 map, based on the rezoning legislation introduced in board file 250700, was the most recent parcel-level map released by the Planning Department. The most significant amendments passed include exempting rent-controlled buildings of three units or larger from the local program, and exempting hotel parcels. *Planning recently released a November 17th map but it is not accurate as it does not yet exclude three-units+ rent controlled buildings.*

***Figure 2*** below shows that 6,938 new parcels were added in the proposed rezoning plan, 7,580 parcels have increased heights, and 16,135 parcels allow for greater densities. Associated unit counts were also estimated and are provided in the table following Figure 2.




**Figure 2. Parcels added and parcels with increased heights and densities under the rezoning**

1. **What was added to the Family Zoning Plan from the FEIR?**

| What was added | Added by FZP | Current Unit Count |
|---|---|---|
| New Parcels | 6,938 parcels | 12,150 units |
| Increased Height Parcels | 7,580 parcels | 10,009 units |
| Increased Density Parcels | 16,135 parcels | 16,135 units |
| **Total Unanalyzed Parcels** | **30,653 parcels** | **38,692 units impacted** |

**2) Scope of Family Zoning Plan vs. 2022 Final EIR**

| Total Count | Final EIR - 2022 | Family Zoning Plan - 2025 |
|---|---|---|
| Parcel Count | 82,834 | 79,932 |
| Current Units Count* | 150,031 | 94,281 |
| Area Added (sq ft) | 257,461,954 | 254,211,574 |

** Residential and non-residential "units" (commercial spaces) impacted*

3. **Existing Parcels with increased height limits**

**a.** **7,580 parcels** with increased height limits
**b.** **10,009 currently existing units** in parcels with increased height limits
**c.** **31,424,690 sq ft** of total lot area in parcels with increased height limits

| Height Limit Increase | Parcels | Current Unit Count |
|---|---|---|
| 100' + | 73 | 201 |
| 60' - 100' | 34 | 31 |
| 40' - 60' | 667 | 823 |
| 20' - 40' | 3,244 | 4,906 |
| < 20' | 3,562 | 4,048 |

The following discussion describes potential impacts that were not analyzed in the CEQA document for the rezoning project. The Addendum is inadequate under CEQA and a supplemental EIR must be prepared to identify and analyze the potentially new and more severe impacts described below.

**A. Rezoning of the North Point Wet Weather Sewage Treatment Facility**

There are new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed rezoning plan that were not identified and assessed in the Housing Element EIR or Addendum including impacts associated with development of the North Point Wet Weather Facility located at Bay Street and the Embarcadero. This City-owned and -operated sewage treatment plant is one of three facilities in San Francisco that treats wastewater. It is only active during wet weather and treats up to 150 million gallons a day (MGD) during rainstorms, or 26 percent of the wastewater treated on a rainy day.

The 2022 FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of this treatment plant with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning at that time. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' to 85' and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional.

There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development at this location. Since it is inconceivable that a developer would build housing on top of a sewage treatment plant, the City needs to analyze the impacts associated with elimination of the sewage treatment plant.

Moreover, although the Addendum states that "It is likely that the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant would experience reduced pollutant loads under the proposed rezoning program compared to the adopted housing element because housing growth distribution under the proposed rezoning program would be more evenly distributed in the western and northern parts of the city and along transit corridors, instead of heavily concentrated in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, and Richmond planning districts as assumed under the adopted housing element; thus pollutant load generation, would be more evenly distributed throughout the city rather than concentrated in the western portion of the city," there is no mention at all of the North Point treatment plant. (See pages 127-128 of the Addendum.)

Potentially significant impacts that should have been identified and analyzed in a supplemental EIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Elimination of the sewage treatment plant would result in reduced sewage treatment capacity during wet weather. This would require (a) the construction of a new sewage treatment facility in this area of the city, or (b) the construction of new infrastructure to convey wastewater from the northeast quadrant of the city to the Oceanside Treatment Plant or the Southeast Treatment Plant in Bayview/Hunters Point and expansion of one of these facilities to expand the treatment capacity by 150 MGD to compensate for the loss of the North Point facility.

2. The potential public health and hazardous materials impacts of redeveloping the site with housing must be identified and analyzed and mitigation measures must be identified in a supplemental EIR. This includes but would not be limited to

testing and classification of contaminants, calculations of health risk, specific remediation measures, associated secondary impacts due to the excavation of contaminated soil, transportation and disposal of infrastructure, and treatment and disposal of contaminated water and soil.

**B. More severe displacement Impacts would result from the proposed rezoning program than were assumed in the Housing Element FEIR**

Potentially significant displacement impacts that should have been identified and analyzed in a supplemental EIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. ***Rezoning and displacement of tenants in two-unit rent-controlled buildings***. As shown below, under the proposed rezoning, there are a significant number of two-unit rent-controlled buildings on parcels with an existing height limit of 40 feet that would be rezoned to allow heights of 50', 65' and 85', and would no longer require setbacks, creating greater incentives and likelihood that they would be redeveloped under the proposed rezoning. In other words, it is reasonably foreseeable that they would be redeveloped and therefore should have been considered in the CEQA review for the project.

**<u>Rent Controlled Parcels</u>**

| What was added | Parcels affected | Existing units affected |
|---|---|---|
| New Parcels | 1,237 parcels | 2,474 units |
| Increased Height Parcels | 1,818 parcels | 3,636 units |
| Increased Density Parcels | 783 parcels | 1,566 units |
| Total Rent Controlled Parcels | 3,838 parcels | 7,676 units |

It is widely accepted that tenants of two-unit rent-controlled buildings already have fewer protections than tenants who live in buildings with three or more units because a two-unit building can more easily be converted into condos. In two-unit buildings, all an owner needs to do is move in, and they can evict a tenant to do so.

The inclusion of parcels with two-unit rent controlled buildings in the rezoning plan and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR.

2. ***Rezoning and displacement in the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District.*** Section 249.97 (b) of the San Francisco Planning Code states that "The Priority Equity Geographies SUD is comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations" and that the 2022 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan ((2022 Housing Element) identifies them as "***areas***…***where zoning changes must be tailored to serve the specific needs of the communities that live there; and where programs that stabilize communities and meet community needs need to be prioritized***."

   As shown in ***Figure 2*** above and quantified below, close to 1,000 parcels in the proposed rezoning program that were not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR are located within the PEG SUD. Displacement impacts for residents in these areas are more severe than for residents outside of the SUD.

   **New Priority Equity Geography Parcels**
   a. 939 parcels
   b. 2,321 current existing units (including RC and non-RC)
   c. 70 two-unit RC buildings, 140 units

   The inclusion of parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD and the associated displacement impacts need to be identified and assessed in a supplemental EIR.

3. ***Rezoning and displacement of Laguna Hospital and Rehabilitation Center occupants***. As shown in ***Figure, 2*** above, the 62-acre Laguna Honda hospital and rehabilitation center located 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard was added to the rezoning plan, and if redeveloped would result in significant displacement impacts for the long-term nursing home residents.

   Laguna Honda has 769 beds and offers short-term rehab and long-term nursing care. in the Forest Hill neighborhood of San Francisco.

   The FEIR did not address the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda with housing because this site was not designated for rezoning. The rezoning program changes the allowable height limit on this site from 40' which covers the majority of the 62 acres under existing height limits, to 85' for the entire site, and increases the likelihood that it would be redeveloped with housing. The site is in the P (Public) District where residential uses in 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects and Educator Housing Projects are permitted, and other residential uses are conditional.

There is no reason the City would include this site in the rezoning program other than the fact that the City believes rezoning this site will increase the likelihood of housing development there.

Because the impacts of redevelopment of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center was not analyzed in the Housing Element FEIR, a supplemental EIR is needed to determine the impacts and required mitigation measures.

# EXHIBIT B

November 30, 2025

Mr. Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

RE: Family Zoning Plan (Rezone) – Impacts on Historic Resources

Dear Mr. Drury,

This letter sets forth my professional opinion concerning the impacts on historic resources from the proposed San Francisco Rezoning Plan ("Rezone"), also known as the "Family Zoning Plan."

As a professional with 32 years of experience in historic preservation and with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), I meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History. I also have the following credentials: received a Master of Arts Degree in Architectural History from the University of Virginia's School of Architecture; previously served as president of the San Francisco Landmarks Advisory Board (appointed by Mayor Newsom); since 2012 have continuously been on the City of San Francisco Planning Department's approved consultant pool for historic resources consultants; and certified by the San Francsico Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) as a woman-owned Local Business Enterprise (LBE). I have written innumerable historic resource and historic district designation and evaluation reports throughout the course of my career.

While the City of San Francisco (City) prepared and certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for its 2022 Housing Element, the proposed Rezone is vastly different from the rezoning scenarios studied in the 2022 EIR. Nevertheless, the Planning Department proposes to rely on an Addendum (September 3, 2022) to the previously certified EIR. A rezoning of this magnitude requires thorough environmental review under CEQA so that the City's residents and decision-makers can be aware of its impacts, can consider all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, and can have a robust and open discussion prior to making irreversible changes to San Francisco's landscape for all time.

The Rezone would result in a myriad of significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the 2022 EIR or included in the Housing Element, not the least of which are impacts to historic resources. The Rezone would result in significant impacts to historic resources that have not yet been analyzed. The 2022 EIR found significant and unmitigated impacts to historic resources, but the Rezone's impacts are far greater and substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR, with significant and unmitigated impacts. Since "significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR," a Supplemental EIR is required. (CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(1)(3)(B).)

a+h 1715 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone*: 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

As set forth in the Attachments to this letter, the Rezone would allow the demolition and redevelopment on, near, or within areas containing historic resources. Many known and designated, either locally under Article 10 of the Planning Code, or through state or federal historic designation programs, are within areas that were not included for rezoning in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, while others were included in the analysis, but have since been upzoned or changed to form based density or have significantly higher heights on or around them by the Upzone. None of the potentially significant impacts that could result from redevelopment of these historic resources were analyzed in the 2022 EIR. See the following attachments for further analysis: Attachment 1 - Historic Resource Impact Analysis of Rezone and Attachment 2 - North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District Parcel Analysis.

Since this new information provided in the Attachments constitute significant and substantially more severe effects not discussed in the 2022 EIR, a Supplemental EIR is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts. The newly identified impacts are beyond the scope of the 2022 EIR. The Addendum barely mentions additional historic resources impacts and fails to analyze impacts of the drastically additional height and density increases as they relate to known historic resources. Further, the Addendum fails to analyze changes in zoning use districts on designated historic resources or historic districts or areas with known concentrations of "A" rated historic resources, which are identified, but not yet designated resources.

Further, the Rezone now includes the following language related to Bonuses for "Historic Preservation." However, these bonuses, as shown below, encourage height increases, facadism, and other over-scaled additions that would result in diminished historic fabric and result in unintended impacts to historic resources. Additionally, this proposed legislation, added in the September 11, 2025 version of the legislation, has not been evaluated for its potentially significant impacts on historic resources.

The following language has been added to Section 206.10(e) of the Rezone legislation providing additional height and square footage bonuses for the "preservation" of Historic Building.

> *(e)* ***Additional Height, Square Footage, and Other Bonuses.*** *HC-SF Projects that contain certain uses, amenities, or other building features are eligible for additional bonuses and code modifications, as described below.*

*********

(6) ***Preservation of Historic Buildings.*** *In districts other than Residential districts, projects proposing an alteration to a Historic Building and/or constructing new buildings on sites that contain a Historic Building shall be permitted to include additional square footage, as provided below:*

*(A) up to 1.5 times the gross floor area foregone by retaining the Historic Building and complying with Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings, including through setting back building additions and/or new construction in relation to the Historic Building. For the purposes of this subsection (e)(56)(A), the foregone gross floor area shall be equal to the gross floor area within the volume that would otherwise be permitted under the Planning Code and all applicable Objective Standards, inclusive of modifications allowed pursuant to this Section 206.10, but is not being constructed in order to accommodate a reduced building mass above or around a Historic Building and that complies with or exceeds the setbacks or mass reductions required by the Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings. The Zoning Administrator may publish further guidance on the calculation of foregone gross floor area; and*

*(B)* for Historic Buildings with storefronts that contain character-defining features, an additional 0.25 square feet for every square foot of space in the storefront, provided that the project preserves the storefront in compliance with Objective Standards pertaining to Historic Buildings; and

(C) *horizontal or vertical additions to accommodate this extra square footage, except that any such additions shall not:*

*(i) exceed 20 feet above the Housing Choice-SF height limit (Section 263.19); or*

*(ii) reduce the required rear yard above the ground floor to less than 15 feet where the site abuts the rear yard of adjacent parcels containing residential uses.*

(D*) The Historic Building* and/or historic storefront *shall be maintained in compliance with the Preservation Design Standards for the life of the project, and the requirement shall be recorded in a Notice of Special Restrictions.*

This late addition of the above language to the legislation has the great potential to cause impacts to historic resources, instead of preserving them, as it would allow large sections of historic buildings to be demolished and over scaled additions and height increases to be implemented as bonuses.

For the reasons listed above, and as set forth in the Attachments, it is my professional opinion that the Rezone, if approved, would have additional and substantially more severe impacts to historic resources than were analyzed in the certified EIR. These potentially significant environmental impacts must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") through a full recirculated Supplemental EIR.

Sincerely,

Bridget Maley
Principal

Attachment 1: Historic Resource Impact Analysis of Rezone
Attachment 2: North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District Parcel Analysis

a+h 1715 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone*: 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

**Attachment 1: Historic Resource Impact Analysis of Family Zoning Plan (Rezone)**
**November 30, 2025**
**Compiled by Bridget Maley, architecture + history, llc**

---

The Family Zoning Plan (Rezone) would result in significant new impacts on historic resources that were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in its associated Environmental Impact Report (2022 EIR). The area of the Rezone is significantly larger than the area included in the 2022 Housing Element and analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

It should be noted that all projects using the Rezone would be subject to form-based density (i.e. density decontrol) regardless of height limit or underlying zoning district. These height and density changes would encourage demolition of smaller-scale historic resources throughout the Rezone area.

In addition, for many parcels within the Rezone area, increases to the existing base height limits and/or changes from density limited to form based density (i.e. density decontrol) would be allowed for projects NOT using the Rezone, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses.

The Housing Element EIR Addendum No. 1 (September 3, 2025) fails to analyze impacts of additional height and density increases described above, as well as changes in zoning use districts, on designated historic resources and historic districts or on areas with known concentrations of “A” rated historic resources, but not yet designated as historic districts, including, but not limited to those resources listed below.

The list below includes landmarks and contributors to historic districts designated pursuant to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code that may be removed from the Upzone by a pending amendment to the Upzone legislation.

**Historic Resources Not Evaluated in 2022 Housing Element EIR**

The following districts and individual historic resources were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, but are now included in the Rezone as of November 2025.

- Fully documented North Beach National Register Historic District submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office and awaiting hearing by the State Historical Resource Commission was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone could have significant impacts to this identified historic district, including heights rezoned from 40 feet to 50 feet in block Block 0076. (See Attachment 2: List of Historic Resources in North Beach Historic District in Rezone.)

- Designated Northeast Waterfront Article 10 Historic District. Sansome Street Area Revision contained in “Appendix D: Memorandum Regarding Potential Zoning Map Changes in Supervisor District 3” disclosed the intent to include in the Rezone Plan areas within this Historic District centered along Sansome Street include the following seventeen parcels: Block 0085/Lots 005 and 048; Block 0106/Lots 001, 002, 003, 004, and 042; Block 0112/Lots 008 and 009; Block 0113/Lots 006, 041, 040, and 063; Block 0134/Lot 001; and Block 0135/Lots 007, 008, and 009. This area was not included in the

2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible Washington Square Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone now includes six parcels on Filbert Street between Powell Street and Stockton Street, including the Church of Saints Peter and Paul and the Priests' Residence, which could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible Upper Grant Avenue Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. This area was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone now includes seven contributory buildings in this District along Filbert Street, Medau Place, and Grant Avenue (Blk 0088/Lots 5, 41-57, and 9), which could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Otis Elevator Company National Register No. 99001265 (1 Beach Street; Parcel 0018/001). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Grabhorn Press Building National Register No. 97000349 (1335 Sutter Street; Parcel 0690/012A). This parcel was rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses.This drastic upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Thomas Payne House National Register No. 80000847 (1409 Sutter Street; Parcel 0689/025). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses. This drastic upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Myrtle Street Flats Building, both National Register No. 76000520 and Article 10 Landmark No. 71 (234-248 Myrtle Street; Parcel 0714/020), sometimes referred to as part of the Goodman Building. This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 650 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 260 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses.This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Washington Square Article 10 Landmark No. 226 (1651 Stockton Street and Filbert Street; 0102/022001). The parcels on the northern edge of Washington Square are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this park.
- Designated Article 10 "Structure of Merit" The Cannery (600 Beach Street; Parcel 0010/001). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. As the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Building at 1840-1842 Eddy Street National Register No. 73000437 (1840-1842 Eddy Street, Parcel 1127/015). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 85 feet and changed to form-based density (density decontrol). This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Building at 45-57 Beideman Place National Register No. 73000436 (45-57 Beideman Place, Parcel 1100/118). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Building at 33-35 Beideman Place National Register No. 73000435 (33-35 Beideman Place, Parcel 1100/095). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated House at 1331-1335 Scott Street National Register No. 73000440 (1331-35 Scott Street, Parcel 1100/120). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated House at 1321 Scott Street National Register No. 7300439 (1321 Scott Street, Parcel 1100/049). This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated House at 1249-1251 Scott Street National Register No. 73000442 (1249-51 Scott Street, Parcel 1127/035). This parcel now included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated House at 1239-1245 Scott Street National Register No. 7300441 (1239-45 Scott Street, Parcel 1127/043). This parcel now included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-1 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Temple Sherith Israel National Register #10000114 (2266 California St., Parcel 0637/011). Now included in the Rezone, this parcel is being upzoned from its existing 40 feet to 85 feet with a new base height of 50 feet. It is also changed to form based density and rezoned to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Dallam-Merritt House National Register #84001185 (2355 Washington Street, Parcel 0613/021). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Designated site of Third Baptist Church California Registered Historical Landmark No. 1010 (483 Greenwich Street, Parcel 0087047). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Designated Fillmore-Pine Building National Landmark No. 82002247 (1940-1946 Fillmore Street, Parcel 0660/023). Now in the Rezone, this parcel is being rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Park View Hotel National Register No. 83001235 (750 Stanyan Street, Parcel 1250/025). Now in the Rezone, this parcel is being rezoned from its existing height limit of 50 feet to 65 feet. This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Delane House National Register No. 82000984 (70 Buena Vista Terrace, Parcel 2608/013). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated House at 584 Page Street National Register No. 85002195 (584 Page Street, Parcel 0842/017). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Moss Beach House National Register No. 83001232 (1626 Great Highway, Parcel 1895/038). Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Real Estate Associates (TREA) Houses National Register No. 85000705 (2503, 2524, 2530 and 2536 Clay Street (Parcel 0630/032, 0611/008, 0611/009 and 0611/010). Now in the Rezone, the house at 2503 Clay is upzoned from 40 feet to 65 feet. These 4 historic houses were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Wilford Houses National Register No.85001914 (2121 & 2127 Vallejo Street, Parcels 0565/021and 0565/022). Now in the Rezone, these parcels adjoin parcels upzoned to 65 feet. These 2 historic houses were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Sinton House National Register No. 11000944(1020 Francisco Street, Parcel 0476002C).Now in the Rezone, this parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Russian Hill Paris Block Architectural Historic District National Register of Historic Places Historic District No. 87002288. The Rezone includes four parcels in this District between Green Street and Macondray Lane (Block 0121/Lots 005, 006, 049, and 056), which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Russian Hill Macondray Lane National Register Historic District No. 87002286. The Rezone includes this entire Historic District, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this Historic District, especially corner parcels that could be up to 65 feet in height in this residential district.

- Designated Port of San Francisco Embarcadero National Register Historic District No. 06000372. The Rezone includes increased height and density along the Embarcadero, especially on Bay, North Point, Beach and Jefferson Streets, which could impact this Historic District. These heights, not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR, could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Golden Gate Park National Register Historic District No. 04001137. The Rezone includes height increases along Fulton Street and Lincoln Boulevard bordering the north and south sides of Golden Gate Park and Stanyon Street bordering the east side. The heights along Fulton Street are increased from 40 feet to 85 feet and along

Lincoln from 40 feet to 65 feet, both streets are changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned to RTO-C that allows commercial uses on the ground floors. Heights along a portion of Stanyan Street are rezoned from 50 feet to 65 feet. Heights are also increased in places along Fell and Oak Streets in the Panhandle of the Park. These proposed height, density, and use changes in the Rezone were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and would have significant impacts on this designated historic district.

- Designated Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark Historic District No. 66000232. Development proposed in the Rezone adjacent to the Presidio of San Francisco at 300 Lake Street; Parcel No. 1354/001, upzoned from 40 feet to 65 and from 65 feet to 85 feet. Also upzoned at the Lombard Gate from 40 feet to 65 feet. Additionally, development in the residential zoned areas of Presidio Terrace and Sea Cliff heights would be allowed to 65 feet on 8,000 square foot parcels. These Rezone heights were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel National Register Historic District No. 91000957. Height increases along the edges would impact this designated Historic District. The increased heights at Bush and Leavenworth Streets from the existing height limit of 65 feet to 120 feet and Polk Street between Geary and Sutter Streets from the existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet. These heights were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could impact this Historic District.

- Designated Veterans Affairs Medical Center National Register Historic District No. 05001112 (4150 Clement Street). Along the southern edge of this District the Rezone includes increases from the existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet on Clement Street. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could impact this Historic District.

- Designated Cable Car National Register Historic District No. 66000233. The Cable Car lines located within areas being upzoned and/or density decontrolled by the Upzone Plan could be significantly impacted. These include, without limitation, those lines along the following routes: Hyde between Beach and Washington, Washington between Hyde and Mason, Jackson between Leavenworth and Hyde, California between Van Ness and Mason, Mason between Green and Columbus, Columbus between Mason and Taylor, and Taylor between Chestnut and Francisco. Height increases adjacent to these streets could impact these linear transit historic resources, and construction activities resulting from development incentivized by the Upzone could cause extensive service interruptions. Impacts to the Cable Car National Register Historic District were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Geneva Office Building and Power House (S.F. & San Mateo Railroad Co.Office Building), both National Register No. 10000111 and Article 10 Landmark No. 180 (500 Geneva; Parcel 6972/036). The Rezone Plan upzones this publicly owned site from the existing height of 40 feet to 85 feet and includes it in the Non-Contiguous SFMTA Special Use District, which allows the site to be developed for mixed use residential development. The Rezone Plan also increases the base height limit from 40

feet to 50 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would allow development using the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide density or development bonuses. New development on and adjacent to this historic site could result in significant impacts. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Eligible Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. The current Rezone includes a significant portion of the District. This area of Hayes Valley was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible Northpoint Sewage Treatment Plant Historic District, an eligible National Register and California Historic District. The District includes 101 North Point (Parcel 0033/005), 66 Bay Street (0034/002) and 160 Bay Street (0033/003). This entire site is increased from the existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. The Rezone of this eligible district was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this District.

- Designated Dietle Residence Article 10 Landmark No.48 (294 Page Street, Parcel 0839/017). Located within and adjacent to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District, the Rezone includes this parcel which is rezoned to RTO-1.This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Nightingale House Article 10 Landmark No. 47 (201 Buchanan Street, Parcel 0858/002). Located within and adjacent to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District, the Rezone includes this parcel which is rezoned to RTO-1.This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated McMorry-Lagan Building Article 10 Landmark No.164 (188-198 Haight Street, Parcels 0852/033 and 0852/034). Located within and adjacent to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District, the Rezone includes this parcel which is rezoned to RTO-1.This parcel was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Designated Duboce Park Article 10 Historic District, specifically the contributory buildings located along Waller and Steiner Streets being rezoned RTO-1. Although certain parcels within the Duboce Park Historic District are proposed for removal from the Rezone by a pending amendment to the Upzone legislation (see list below), the contributory buildings located along Waller and Steiner Streets would remain in the Rezone. This Historic District was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

---

**Historic Resources Evaluated in 2022 Housing Element and 2022 EIR, But Now with Significant Height Increases**

- Designated St. Luke's Episcopal Church, National Register No. 100009644 (1755 Clay; Parcel 0622/013). Included in the 2022 EIR as being upzoned from its existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet, but height increased by the Rezone to 350 feet with a base height of 140 feet. These increased heights were not studied in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this historic site. Further, as the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed from the new base height.

- Designated Paige Motor Company National Register No. 83001234 (1699 Van Ness Parcel 0642/001). Included in the 2022 EIR as being upzoned from existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet, but height increased by the Rezone to 350 feet with a base height of 140 feet. These increased heights were not studied in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this historic site. Further, as the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed from the new base height.

- Eligible Ocean Avenue Commercial Historic District, a documented eligible California Register Historic District under review by the Planning Department. The EIR analyzed the height along Ocean Avenue at a height of 65 feet, which was increased by the Rezone to 85 feet. This increased height was not studied in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts to this Historic District.

- Eligible fully documented Ingleside Terraces National Register Historic District submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office and awaiting hearing by the State Historical Resource Commission. The EIR analyzed the height along Ocean Avenue, Block 6915, with a height of 65 feet, which was increased by the Rezone to both 85 feet and 140 feet. These increased heights were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could have significant impacts on this fully documented historic district.

- Designated St. Francis Wood National Register Historic District No. 100007846 was listed on June 30, 2022. This historic district was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone could have significant impacts on this historic district.

- *The Gardens in the City; San Francisco Residence Parks, 1906-1940, Historic Context Statement* identified 8 residence parks neighborhoods as eligible historic districts. Since this was last heard by the Historic Preservation Commission in April 2021, St. Francis Wood has been listed on the National Register of Historic Place No. 100007846 and Ingleside Terraces has been fully documented as a National Register Historic District and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office. Six other neighborhoods Jordan Park, West Clay Park, Forest Hill and Forest Hill Extension, Sea Cliff, Lincoln Manor and

Balboa Terrace are identified as potential historic districts. These six neighborhoods would be impacted by upzoning in and along the edges.

- Historic Category "A" rated buildings across the city would be impacted by the Rezone as it affords no protection for these previously identified, but not designated historic resources. The City of San Francisco Planning Department has previously required full Historic Resource Evaluations for projects involving Category "A" rated buildings. This policy change was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

**The following landmarks and contributors to historic districts designated pursuant to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code may be removed from the Upzone by a pending amendment to the Upzone legislation:**

- Designated Telegraph Hill Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this entire Historic District, which was not in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Designated Alamo Square Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes most of this Historic District, including increased heights from 40 feet to 50 feet along Scott Street. This District was not in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to the District.
- Designated Webster Street Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this entire Historic District, which was not in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Haslett Warehouse, both National Register No. 75000172 and Article 10 Landmark No. 57 (680 Beach Street; Parcel 0010/002). he Rezone includes this parcel, owned by the United States National Park Service, upzoning it from its existing height of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated San Francisco Art Institute Article 10 Landmark No 85 including the Diego Rivera Gallery Landmark No 284 (800 Chestnut Street; Parcel 0049/001). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height of 40 feet to 50 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Ghiradelli Square, both National Register No. 82002249 and Article 10 Landmark No. 36 (920 North Point; Parcel 0452/002). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Designated Goodman Building/Emeric Building, both National Register No. 75000473 and Article 10 Landmark No. 71 (1117 Geary Blvd; Parcel 0714/018). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 650 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 260 feet and changes the density to form-based, which would encourage demolition and development using the State Density Bonus or

other State programs that provide density or development bonuses. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 650 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated First Unitarian Church Article 10 Landmark No. 40 (1187 Franklin Street; Parcel 0713/034). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and, as the density is form-based, use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be encouraged. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 650 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Earl C. Anthony Packard Showroom Article 10 Landmark No. 153 (901 Van Ness Avenue; Parcel 0719/002). The parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and, as the density is form-based, use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be encouraged. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 500 feet and 350 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Don Lee Auto Showroom, both National Register No. 01001179 and Article 10 Landmark No.152 (1000 Van Ness Avenue; Parcel 0715/014). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 500 feet. The Rezone also increases the base height limit from 130 feet to 200 feet and as the density is form-based, use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be encouraged. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 500 feet and 650 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Stradtmuller House, both National Register No. 76000523 and Article 10 Landmark No. 35 (819 Eddy Street; Parcel 0743/015). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 130 feet to 300 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 350 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Engine Company Number 31 Fire House Article 10 Landmark No. 220 (1088 Green St (0121/010). This parcel is now within the Rezone but was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic building.

- Designated Clay Theater Article 10 Landmark No. 302 (2261 Fillmore Street; Parcel 0630/002). This parcel and area of Fillmore Street are rezoned from their existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and this could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 65 feet, which could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Designated Calvary Presbyterian Church National Register No 78000755 and Article 10 Landmark No. 103 (2501 Fillmore Street; Parcel 0587/027). This parcel and area of Fillmore are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Grace Cathedral Article 10 Landmark No. 170 (1100 California Street; Parcel 0246/001). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Chambord Apartments, both Article 10 Landmark No. 106 and National Register No. 84001184 (1298 Sacramento Street; Parcel 0221/125). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Old Flood Mansion, Pacific Union Club, both Article 10 Landmark No. 64 and National Register No. 66000230 (1000 California Street; Parcel 0245/001). This parcel and area of Nob Hill are now within the Rezone but were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. This could result in significant impacts to this site.
- Designated Westfield House Article 10 Landmark No. 135 (1198 Fulton Street, Parcel 0777/015) located in the Alamo Square Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. The Rezone could result in significant impacts to this historic site and the Alamo Square Historic District.
- Designated Third Baptist Church Complex Article 10 Landmark No. 275 (1399 McAllister Street, Parcel 0778/013). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. The Rezone could result in significant impacts to this historic site.
- Designated Archbishop's Mansion Article 10 Landmark No. 151 (1000 Fulton Street, Parcel 0778/006) located in the Alamo Square Article 10 Historic District. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. The Rezone could result in significant impacts to this historic site and the Alamo Square Historic District.
-

- Designated Abner Phelps House, both National Register No. 71000187 and Article 10 Landmark No. 32 (1111 Oak Street; Parcel 1218/050). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Sarah Mish House, both National Register No. 79000534 and Article 10 Landmark No. 62 (1153 Oak Street; Parcel 1218/029). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site.

- Designated Firehouse Engine Company No. 2, both Article 10 Landmark No. 89 (1152 Oak Street, Parcel 1215/010) and a contributor to the Buena Vista North Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. The inclusion of this parcel in the Rezone was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned 65 feet and 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Richard Doolan/Norman Larson Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 253 (557 Ashbury Street, Parcel 1231/009). As the density is form-based, the use of the State Density Bonus or other State programs that provide development bonuses would be allowed. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 65 feet with form-based density and rezoned to RTO-C, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Theodore Green Apothecary Article 10 Landmark No. 182 (500 Divisadero Street, Parcel 1203/017A). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Charles L. Hinkel House and Carriage House Article 10 Landmark No. 190 (280 Divisadero Street; Parcel 1238/023). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Designated Old Saint Patrick's Church Article 10 Landmark No. 6 (1820 Eddy Street, Parcel 1127/007A). This parcel now included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol) and rezoned from RM-3 to RTO-C which allows commercial uses on the ground floor. These changes were not included in the 2022 Housing

Element or analyzed in the EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 65 feet with form-based density and rezoned to RTO-C, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Glazer-Keating House Article 10 Landmark No. 251 (1110 Taylor Street, Parcel 0222/018). The Rezone now includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Merryvale Antiques (S.F. Gas Light Co.) Article 10 Landmark No 58 (3640 Buchanan Street, Parcel 0459/003) This parcel is included in the Rezone and changed to form-based density (density decontrol). The Rezone now includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Ladies Protection and Relief Society Article 10 Landmark No 320 ( 3400 Laguna Street, Parcel 0471/003). The Rezone now includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Blackstone Court Article 10 Historic District (30 Blackstone Court, 1545 Lombard Street, and 1549 Lombard Street (Parcels 0504/003, 0504/003H & 0504/019). The Rezone increases the height of two of the parcels in this District from 40 feet to140 feet and the density is changed to form-based. This Historic District was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is surrounded by parcels zoned to 140 feet with form-based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- North End Police Station and Garage Article 10 Landmark No. 218 (2475 Greenwich, Parcel 0513/015). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Filbert Street Cottages Article 10 Landmark No 232 (1338 Lombard Street, Parcel 0524/031). This parcel is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR and could result in significant impacts to this historic site. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Metro Theater Article 10 Landmark No 261 (2055 Union Street, Parcel 0541/018. The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This site was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- The Colonial Dames (McElroy) Octagon House Article 10 Landmark No. 17 and National Register No 720000250 (2645 Gough Street, Parcels 0544/001 and 0544/001C. This historic site, included in the Upzone, is rezoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet and its density changed to form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Alhambra Theater Article 10 Landmark No. 21 (2320-366 Polk Street, Parcel 0548/022). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 to 85 and now form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- The Burr Mansion Article 10 Landmark No.31 and National Register #14000967 (1772 Vallejo Street, Parcel 0552/029). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Golden Gate Valley Carnegie Library Article 10 Landmark No. 300 (1801 Green Street, Parcel 0554/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Casebolt House Article 10 Landmark No 51 (2727 Pierce Street, Parcel 0560/005). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Church For The Fellowship of All People Article 10 Landmark No. 309 (2041 Larkin Street, Parcel 0572/003). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Engine Company No. 8 Truck No. 4 Article 10 Landmark No. 188 (1648 Pacific St., Parcel 0574/011). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 350 feet. This extreme upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 350 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Talbot-Dutton House Article 10 Landmark No. 57 (2200 Franklin/1782 Pacific Avenue, Parcel 0575/010). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 80 feet to 240 feet, its density is changed form-based, and rezoned from residential to RTO-C. This extreme rezoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 240 feet to 350 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- St. Brigid's Church Article 10 Landmark No. 252 (2151 Van Ness Avenue, Parcel 575/015). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 80 feet to 350. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 240 feet to 350 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Bourne Mansion Article 10 Landmark No 38 (2550 Webster Street, Parcel 0580/013). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 65 feet, and rezoned from residential to RTO-C. Even if this parcel is removed from the Rezone, because it is adjacent to parcels zoned up to 65 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Leale House Article 10 Landmark No. 45 (2475 Pacific Avenue, Parcel 0587/018). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Whittier Mansion Article 10 Landmark No. 75 and National Register No 76000524 (2090 Jackson St, Parcel 0591/007). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Haas-Lilienthal House Article 10 Landmark No. 69 and National Register No 730000438 (2007 Franklin St. 0600/002). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Spreckels Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 197 (2080 Washington Street, Parcel 0601/005. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Sacred Heart Parish Complex Article 10 Landmark No.316 and National Register 10000112 (660 Oak Street, Parcel 0828/012; 735 Fell Street, Parcel 0828/022A; 554 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/22; and 546-548 Filmore Street, Parcel 0828/21). The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.

- Market Street Masonry Historic District Article 10 Historic District and listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (7 non-contiguous historic buildings on Market Street Between Franklin Street and Valencia Street, including Parcels 3504/038, 3504/040, 3504/046, 3504/001, 0854/004 and 0854/005, and the Miramar Apartments at 1582 Market Street, Parcel 0836/010. The Rezone includes the parcels in this District, which are upzoned from their existing height limit of 85 feet to 140 feet. Even if these parcels are removed from the Upzone, because they are surrounded by parcels rezoned to 140 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Health Sciences Library Article 10 Landmark No. 115 (2395 Sacramento Street, Parcel 0637/016). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- William Vale House Article 10 Landmark No. 168 (2226 California Street, Parcel 0637/040). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet, and the density is changed to form-based. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Chambers Mansion Article 10 Landmark No.119 (2220-2222 Sacramento Street, Parcel 0627/054). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Richard E. Queen House Article 10 Landmark No. 198 (2212 Sacramento Street, Parcel 0627/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Atherton House Article 10 Landmark No. 70 and National Register No. 79000527 (1990 California Street, Parcel 0640/010). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet, and rezoned from residential to RTO-C. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Isaac Wormser House/John C. Coleman House Article 10 Landmark No. 53 (1834 California Street, Parcel 0641/005). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Lilienthal-Orville Pratt House Article 10 Landmark No. 55 (1818-1820 California Street, Parcel 0641/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Golden Gate Commandery of the Knights Templar (Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church Article 10 Landmark No. 202 (2135 Sutter Street, Parcel 0682/006). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 50 feet to 85 feet and is now form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Richardson Hall Article 10 Landmark Nos. 256, 257, and 258 (55 Laguna Street, Parcel 0870/001). The Rezone includes these Landmarks, which are upzoned from their existing height limits to 85 feet and their density has been changed to form-based. These buildings were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Carmel Fallon Building Article 10 Landmark No. 223 and Contributor to the designated Hayes Valley Residential Historic District listed on the California Register of Historic Resources (1800-1806 Market Street, Parcel 0871/014). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 85 feet to 120 feet and its density has been changed to form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone,

because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 140 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Roos Residence both Article 10 Landmark No. 56 and National Register 09000805 (3500 Jackson Street, Parcel 0970/002). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Ellingwood House Article 10 Landmark No. 207 (2799 Pacific Ave, Parcel 0978/010) and within the California Register eligible Presidio Heights Historic District. The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Koshland House Article 10 Landmark No. 95 and National Register No. 84001186, within the CA eligible Presidio Heights Historic District. (3800 Washington, Parcel 0989/028). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Ortman-Shumate House Article 10 Landmark No. 98 (1901 Scott Street, Parcel 1027/003). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Theodore Roosevelt Jr. High School Article 10 Landmark No. 285 (460 Arguello Street, Parcel 1061/049). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- San Francisco Memorial Columbarium Article 10 Landmark No. 209 (1 Loraine Court, Parcel 1084/002).The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Clunie House Article 10 Landmark No. 128 (301 Lyon Street, Parcel 1207/008). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Alfred G. Hanson Residence Article 10 Landmark No. 196 (128 27th Avenue, Parcel 1332/049). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- St. John's Presbyterian Church Article 10 Landmark No. 83 (201 Arguello Boulevard, Parcel 1361/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Campfire Girls Building Article 10 Landmark No. 169 (325 Arguello Boulevard), Parcel 1432/003). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Richmond Branch Library Article 10 Landmark No. 247 (351 9th Avenue, Parcel 1441/007). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Refugee Shack Article 10 Landmark No. 171 (1227 24th Avenue, Parcel 1726/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Doelger Building Article 10 Landmark No.265 (320-26 Judah Street, Parcel 1763/020). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet and its density has been changed to form-based. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 85 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Old Fire House Article 10 Landmark No.29 (1348 10th Avenue, Parcel 1764/031). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Sunset Branch Library Article 10 Landmark No. 239 (1305-49 18th Street, Parcel 1773/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 65, 85 and 140 feet, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children Article 10 Landmark No.221 (1601 19th Avenue, Parcel 1924/004). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- San Francisco Conservatory of Music Article 10 Landmark No. 242 (1201 Ortega Street, Parcel 2115/037). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- The McCormick House Article 10 Landmark No. 208 (4040-4042 17th Street, Parcel 2623/012). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 120 feet, its density is changed form-based, and it is rezoned from residential to RTO-C. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 140 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Alfred E. (Nobby) Clarke Mansion Article 10 Landmark No. 80 (250 Douglass St., Parcel 2700/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Miller-Joost House Article 10 Landmark No. 79 (3224 Market Street, Parcel 2704/040). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- David Lewis House Article 10 Landmark No.186 (4143 23rd Street, Parcel 2804/040). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- 171 San Marcos Avenue (aka Cowell House) Article 10 Landmark No. 270 (171 San Marcos Avenue, Parcel 2882/035). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- El Rey Theater Article 10 Landmark No.274 (1970 Ocean Avenue, Parcel 3280/018). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Juvenile Court and Detention Center Article 10 Landmark No. 248 (170 Otis Street, Parcel 3513/207). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 125 feet to 160 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- 396-398 12th Street (aka San Francisco Eagle Bar) Article 10 Landmark No. 295 (396-398 12th Street, Parcel 3522/014). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 55 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Saint Francis Lutheran Church Article 10 Landmark No. 39 (152 Church Street, Parcel 3537010). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 85 feet. This was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Swedish American Hall Building Article 10 Landmark No. 267 (2168-2174 Market Street, Parcel 3542/062). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40-50 feet to 120 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 120 feet and 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- 2117-2123 Market Street (aka New Era Hall) Article 10 Landmark No. 277 (2117-2123 Market Street, Parcel 3543/012). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40-50 feet to 120 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 120 feet and 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- 22 Beaver Street (aka Benedict-Gieling House) Article 10 Landmark No. 284 (22 Beaver Street, Parcel 3561060). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- The Jose Theater/Names Project Building Article 10 Landmark No. 241 (2362 Market Street, Parcel 3562/011). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 120 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the

Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 120 feet and 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.

- Mission Dolores Article 10 Landmark No. 1 and National Register No.72000251 (310-20 Dolores Street, Parcel 3566/001). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Mission High School Article 10 Landmark No. 255 (3750 18th Street, Parcel 3579/006). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the EIR.
- Twin Peaks Tavern Article 10 Landmark No. 264 (3997 17th Street, Parcel 3582/071). The Rezone includes this parcel as being upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 160 feet and its density is changed to form-based. While this site was included in the 2022 Housing Element and the 2022 EIR as upzoned to 85 feet, the Rezone upzones it to 160 feet. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is surrounded by parcels rezoned to 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Castro Theater Article 10 Landmark No. 100 (429-431 Castro Street, Parcel 3582/085). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 65 feet to 85 feet and its density is changed to form-based. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR. Even if this parcel is removed from the Upzone, because it is adjacent to parcels rezoned to 160 feet with form based density, this could result in significant impacts to this historic resource.
- Castro Camera Article 10 Landmark No. 227 (573-75 Castro Street, Parcel 3583/061). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 40 feet to 50 feet. This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Axford House Article 10 Landmark No. 133 (1190 Noe Street, Parcel 6538/048). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Carnegie Noe Valley/Sally Brunn Branch Library Article 10 Landmark No. 259 (451 Jersey Street, Parcel 6539/034). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- 651 Duncan Street (aka Lyon-Martin House) Article 10 Landmark No. 292 (651 Duncan Street, Parcel 6604/036). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
- Sunnyside Conservatory Article 10 Landmark No. 78 (236 Monterey Blvd, Parcel 6770/057). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Joseph Leonard/Cecil F. Poole House Article 10 Landmark No. 213 (90 Cedro Avenue, Parcel 6908/016). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- 1345 Ocean Ave (aka Ingleside Presbyterian Church and the Great Cloud of Witnesses) Article 10 Landmark No. 273 (1345 Ocean Avenue, Parcel 6942/050). The Rezone includes this parcel, which is upzoned from its existing height limit of 50 feet to 85 feet.

- This upzoning was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Sherman House Article 10 Landmark No. 49 (2160 Green Street, Parcels 0540/030 and 0540/028). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Gibbs Residence and Caretaker's Cottage Article 10 Landmark 203 (2622-24 Jackson Street and 2624-29 Pacific Avenue, Parcels 0585/008, 0585/009 and 0585/010). The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.
  .
- Southern Pacific Co. Hospital Complex Article 10 Landmark No. 192 and National Register 89000319 (1400-1599 Fell Street & 1509-1599 Hayes Street, Parcels 1206/002 and 1206/003). Also within the Panhandle Historic District, an eligible California Register Historic District. The Rezone includes these parcels, which were not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Edward Coleman House Article 10 Landmark No. 54 (1701 Franklin Street, Parcels 0641/014 and 0641/015). The Rezone includes this parcel, which was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

- Designated Duboce Park Article 10 Historic District, is proposed for removal from the Rezone except for the contributory buildings located along Waller and Steiner Streets are proposed to be rezoned RTO-1, remaining in the Rezone. This Historic District was not included in the 2022 Housing Element or analyzed in the 2022 EIR.

**Attachment 2: North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District Parcel Analysis Within Rezone**
**November 30, 2025**
**Compiled by Bridget Maley, architecture + history, llc**

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 490 Lombard St | 0062017B | 1926 | C |
| 1916-18 Stockton St | 0062017C | 1940 | C |
| 1922-24 Stockton St | 0062017D | 1940 | C |
| 1934-36 Stockton St | 0062017E | 1940 | C |
| 1946-48 Stockton St | 0062019 | 1908 | C |
| 1952-56 Stockton St | 0062020 | 1908 | C |
| 1958-60 Stockton St | 0062021 | 1906 | C |
| 379-99 Chestnut St/1952-56 Stockton | 0062022 | 1906 | C |
| 1940 Stockton St | 0062052-058 | 1980 | NC |
| 401 Chestnut St/1957-61 Stockton | 0063001 | c. 1906 | C |
| 1951-55 Stockton St | 0063002 | 1906 | C |
| 1943-47 Stockton St | 0063003 | 1907 | C |
| 1935-41 Stockton St | 0063004 | 1907 | C |
| 1929-33 Stockton St | 0063005 | 1907 | C |
| 1923-25 Stockton St | 0063006 | 1908 | C |
| 1915-17 Stockton St | 0063007 | 1907 | C |
| 1901-05 Stockton St | 0063009 | 1906 | C |
| 520-24 Lombard St | 0063010 | 1911 | C |
| 526-30 Lombard St | 0063011 | 1909 | C |
| 532-36 Lombard St | 0063012 | 1912 | C |
| 538-42 Lombard St | 0063013 | 1912 | C |
| 544-46 Lombard St | 0063014 | 1916 | C |
| 548 Lombard St | 0063015 | 1926 | NC |
| 566-76 Lombard St | 0063017 | 1908 | C |
| 590-94 Lombard St | 0063018 | 1925 | C |
| 2006-08 Powell St | 0063018A | 1924 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2018-20 Powell St | 0063018C | 1924 | NC |
| 2024-30 Powell St | 0063019 | 1906 | C |
| 2038-40 Powell St | 0063021 | 1956 | NC |
| 2044-48 Powell St | 0063022 | 1909 | C |
| 2050-64 Powell St | 0063023 | 1907 | C |
| 475 Chestnut St | 0063024 | 1946 | C |
| 461-67 Chestnut St | 0063025 | c. 1907 | C |
| 455-59 Chestnut St | 0063025A | 1908 | C |
| 449-53 Chestnut St | 0063026 | 1912 | C |
| 443-47 Chestnut St | 0063027 | 1908 | C |
| 437-41 Chestnut St | 0063027A | 1908 | C |
| 427 Chestnut St | 0063028 | 1932 | C |
| 421-23 Chestnut St | 0063029 | 1907 | C |
| 1907-13 Stockton St | 0063030-033 | 1906 | C |
| 560-64A Lombard St | 0063034-036 & 16A | 1907 | C |
| 2032-34 Powell St | 0063037-038 | 1912 | C |
| 2061-65 Powell St | 0064001 | 1906 | C |
| 2055-59 Powell St | 0064002 | 1908 | C |
| 2049-53 Powell St | 0064003 | 1909 | C |
| 2043-47 Powell St | 0064004 | 1909 | C |
| 2035-41 Powell St | 0064005 | 1909 | C |
| 2027-31 Powell St | 0064006 | 1907 | C |
| 2017-21 Powell St | 0064007 | 1912 | C |
| 602-04 Lombard St | 0064009 | 1926 | C |
| 616-18 Lombard St | 0064032 | 1922 | C |
| 2011-15 Powell St | 0064033-035 | c. 1912 | C |
| 513-19 Lombard St | 0076001 | 1917 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1847-57 Stockton St | 0076003 | 1910 | C |
| 1843 Stockton St | 0076004 | 1906 | NC |
| 1815-25 Stockton St | 0076006 | 1907 | C |
| 1807-09 Stockton St | 0076007 | 1907 | C |
| 1801-03 Stockton St | 0076008 | 1908 | C |
| 622-24 Greenwich St | 0076009 | 1908 | C |
| 628-30 Greenwich St | 0076010 | 1908 | C |
| 638-42 Greenwich St & 632A Greenwich | 0076011 | 1906 | C |
| 644-46 Greenwich St | 0076012 | 1925 | C |
| 652-56 Greenwich St | 0076013 | 1906 | C |
| 658-64 Greenwich St | 0076014 | 1907 | C |
| 666-76 Greenwich St | 0076015 | 1906 | C |
| 678-80 Greenwich St | 0076016 | 1906 | C |
| 1906 Powell St & 690-92 Greenwich | 0076017 | 1923 | C |
| 1918-22 Powell St | 0076020 | 1906 | C |
| 1930-34 Powell St | 0076022 | 1912 | C |
| 1936-38 Powell St | 0076023 | 1906 | C |
| 1942-46 Powell St | 0076024 | 1912 | C |
| 1948-54 Powell St | 0076025 | 1914 | C |
| 1956-66 Powell St | 0076025A | 1914 | C |
| 585-87 Lombard St | 0076025B | 1908 | C |
| 567-79 Lombard St | 0076026 | 1914 | C |
| 563-65 Lombard St | 0076027 | 1906 | C |
| 551-61 Lombard St | 0076027A | 1914 | C |
| 547-49 Lombard St | 0076028 | 1913 | C |
| 537-39 Lombard St | 0076030 | 1907 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Tuscany Alley | 0076032 | 1906 | C |
| 529-31 Lombard St | 0076033 | 1925 | C |
| 525-27 Lombard St | 0076033A | 1925 | C |
| 543-45 Lombard St | 0076034-035 | 1925 | C |
| 1839-41 Stockton St | 0076054-055 | c. 2014 | NC |
| 1924-26 Powell St | 0076056-057 | 1922 | C |
| 1865-76 Stockton St | 0076058-059 | 1906 | C |
| 5-11 Edith St/1721-25 Grant | 0077008 | 1913 | C |
| 1707-09 Grant Ave | 0077009 | 1907 | NC |
| 1703-05 Grant Ave | 0077010 | 1909 | NC |
| 500-12 Greenwich St | 0077011 | 1908 | C |
| 514-16 Greenwich St & 15-17 Edith | 0077012 | 1924 | C |
| 520-22 Greenwich St & 19-21 Edith | 0077013 | 1910 | C |
| 528-30 Greenwich St & 25-27 Edith | 0077014 | 1909 | C |
| 532-34 Greenwich St | 0077015 | 1908 | C |
| 540 Greenwich St & 33-35 Edith | 0077016 | 1931 | C |
| 544-46 Greenwich St & 43-45 Edith | 0077017 | 1912 | C |
| 550-52 Greenwich St & 49-51 Edith | 0077018 | 1912 | C |
| 558-60 Greenwich St | 0077019 | 1911 | C |
| 562-64 Greenwich St | 0077020 | 1908 | C |
| 568-70 Greenwich St | 0077021 | 1908 | C |
| 586-90 Greenwich St | 0077023 | 1908 | C |
| 1800-04 Stockton St | 0077023A | 1907 | C |
| 1814 Stockton St | 0077024 | 1966 | C |
| 1816-20 Stockton St | 0077025 | 1911 | C |
| 1822-26 Stockton St | 0077026 | 1915 | C |
| 1828-32 Stockton St | 0077027 | 1914 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1848 Stockton St | 0077030 | 1907 | C |
| 1852-56 Stockton St | 0077031 | 1906 | C |
| 1858-60 Stockton St | 0077032 | 1914 | C |
| 1864-66 Stockton St | 0077032A | 1915 | C |
| 576-80 Greenwich St | 0077049-051 | 1997 | NC |
| 1840-44 Stockton St | 0077052-054 | 1911 | C |
| 1653-67 Grant Ave | 0088001 | 1908 | C |
| 1647-51 Grant Ave | 0088002 | 1908 | C |
| 1639-45 Grant Ave | 0088003 | 1913 | C |
| 1635-37 Grant Ave | 0088004 | 1908 | C |
| 12-26 Medau Place & 1615-33 Grant | 0088005 | 1908 | C |
| 1601 Grant Ave | 0088006 | 1965 | NC |
| 540-50 Filbert St & 51-61 Medau | 0088009 | 1909 | C |
| 552-56 Filbert St & 63-65 Medau | 0088010 | 1906 | C |
| 558-62A Filbert St | 0088011 | 1907 | C |
| 566 Filbert St | 0088012 | c. 1907 | C |
| 570-74 Filbert St & 12-18 Krausgrill | 0088013 | 1907 | C |
| 579-81 Greenwich St | 0088023 | 1908 | C |
| 561 Greenwich St | 0088025 | 1961 | C |
| 551-57 Greenwich St | 0088026 | 1911 | C |
| 547-49 Greenwich St | 0088027 | 1911 | C |
| 533-57 Greenwich St | 0088029 | 1912 | C |
| 517-23 Greenwich St | 0088031 | 1912 | C |
| 1-3 Kramer Place | 0088034 | 1910 | C |
| 577 Greenwich St | 0088036 | 1909 | C |
| 567-69 Greenwich St | 0088037 | 1906 | C |
| 19-33 Medau Place | 0088041-048 | 1909 | C |

| Address | APN Number | Year Built | District Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 526-30 Filbert St | 0088052-054 | 1912 | C |
| 532-36 Filbert St | 0088055-057 | c. 1986 | NC |
| 539-45 Greenwich St | 0088058-061 | 1913 | C |
| 525-31 Greenwich St | 0088071-072 | 1914 | C |
| 7-9 Kramer Place | 0088073-074 | 1910 | C |
| 608-20 Filbert St | 0089011 | 1951 | C |
| 622-26 Filbert St | 0089013 | 1913 | C |
| 630-34 Filbert St | 0089014 | 1910 | C |
| 650-60 Filbert St | 0089015 | 1912-1939 | C |
| 666 Filbert St | 0089016 | 1917 | C |
| 673-77 Greenwich St | 0089022A | 1915 | C |
| 667-71 Greenwich St | 0089022B | 1914 | NC |
| 695-99 Greenwich St | 0089022C | 1925 | C |
| 659-59BGreenwich St | 0089024 | 1907/2002 | C/NC |
| 651-55 Greenwich St | 0089025 | 1908 | C |
| 643 Greenwich St | 0089026 | 1907 | C |
| 637-41 Greenwich St | 0089027 | 1911 | C |
| 637A-641A Greenwich St | 0089027 | unknown | C |
| 619-21 Greenwich St | 0089029 | 1961 | C |
| 1856-60 Powell St | 0089031-036 | 1934 | C |
| 625-27 Greenwich St | 0089038 | 1908 | C |
| 631A-C Greenwich St | 0089039-041 | 1983 | NC |
| 1850-52 Powell St | 0089042-043 | 1933 | C |
| 661-65 Greenwich St | 0089044-046 | 1906 | C |
| 680 Filbert St | 0089048-049 | 1971 | NC |
| 690 Filbert St | 0089050-051 | 1961 | NC |

# EXHIBIT C

Shawn Smallwood, PhD
3108 Finch Street
Davis, CA 95616

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

24 October 2025

RE: San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update FEIR Addendum

Dear Mr. Drury,

I write to comment on potential impacts on biological resources from the proposed Addendum to the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). The FEIR, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and later signed by the Mayor on 31 January 2023, evaluated the impacts on the environment that could result from adoption and implementation of the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update. According to the Addendum, the FEIR anticipated "future actions, such as San Francisco Planning Code … amendments, designation of housing sustainability districts, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update." The Addendum characterizes the proposed actions as "reasonably foreseeable changes," and states that its purpose "is to evaluate the environmental impacts of the rezoning program and document the San Francisco Planning Department's … determination that these impacts are adequately addressed in the FEIR." I am concerned that the proposed actions in the Addendum have not been adequately addressed, and that the action's impacts on wildlife would be excessive and highly significant.

My qualifications for preparing expert comments are the following. I hold a Ph.D. degree in Ecology from University of California at Davis, where I also worked as a post-graduate researcher in the Department of Agronomy and Range Sciences. My research has been on animal density and distribution, habitat selection, wildlife interactions with the anthrosphere, and conservation of rare and endangered species. I authored many papers on these and other topics. I served as Chair of the Conservation Affairs Committee for The Wildlife Society – Western Section. I am a member of The Wildlife Society and Raptor Research Foundation, and I've lectured part-time at California State University, Sacramento. I was Associate Editor of wildlife biology's premier scientific journal, The Journal of Wildlife Management, as well as of Biological Conservation, and I was on the Editorial Board of Environmental Management. I have performed wildlife surveys in California for thirty-seven years. My CV is attached.

## POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON THE WILDLIFE COMMUNITY

The Addendum claims that the FEIR's analysis of wildlife impacts potentially caused by the originally planned 50,000 residential units have already addressed the impacts of the additionally proposed of 4,000 residential units. It further claims that the change in

outlay of the height and density of the originally planned 50,000 residential units are irrelevant to the analysis of potential impacts on wildlife. Deemed in no need of additional environmental review is the planned addition of 4,000 residential units, major shifts in the spatial distribution of the original 50,000 units, and increases in maximum building heights from 300 feet to 650 feet.

The Addendum (p. 48) points out that the FEIR had determined that future development associated with the adopted housing element would not adversely affect candidate, sensitive, or special-status species or sensitive natural communities, nor would it interfere with wildlife movement. I disagree with these determinations as they applied to the originally planned 50,000 residential units, as these determinations were simply not credible in the face of this much change to the environment. Here and now the City attempts to extend these same claims to the development associated with an additional 4,000 residential units and to substantial shifts in the spatial and vertical outlay of all 54,000 residential units.

One rationalization for the determinations was that special-status species such as peregrine falcon are adapted to the structural environment of San Francisco. Another was that compliance with existing state and federal regulations would ensure less-than-significant impacts to nesting birds. And for bats, the rationale was that compliance with the open space element of the general plan (Chapter 8 of the San Francisco Environment Code), would avoid potential impacts. These rationalizations, however, were speculative, having cited no evidence in their support. There was no citation of any comparative study of peregrine falcon population performance within the City versus in natural areas. There was no citation of monitoring data that would support the notion that existing state and federal regulations have been preventing significant impacts to nesting birds in the face of development pressure. There was no citation of monitoring data that would support the notion that Chapter 8 of the San Francisco Environment Code has managed to avoid development impacts on bats. Instead of relying on scientific inference, each argument leading to less-than-significant impact determinations was speculative. And this same strategy is carried forward in the Addendum with respect to the added 4,000 residential units and the changes in lateral and vertical outlay.

In fact, the evidence is overwhelming that overall bird abundance is on the decline, having declined 29% across North America over the past half-century (Rosenberg et al. 2019). In fact, all but three of the bat species in California are special-status species, indicating that bats as a taxonomic group are of serious conservation concern in California. And in fact, along with my co-investigator I have measured substantial declines in birds and special-status species as results of development projects (Smallwood and Smallwood 2023). The Addendum selects Peregrine falcon as an anecdote to imply that all birds simply adapt to the cityscape, but even the Peregrine falcon is vulnerable to window collisions. As another anecdote to the Addendum's, I happened to be in a meeting with attorneys of the California Attorney General's Office and agents with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service when we observed a Peregrine falcon nearly collide with our 14$^{th}$ story window as it chased after a rock pigeon in Oakland. And yet another anecdote from a few years ago, a Peregrine falcon fledgling fatally

collided with a window on the same UC Berkely building where it attempted its first flight from the nest. Peregrine falcons are vulnerable to window collision mortality just like any other bird, and perhaps even more so.

The Addendum does not consider the potential loss and fragmentation of the aerosphere in which these species travel and forage. The aerosphere is that part of the gaseous atmosphere where birds and bats and other volant animals with wings migrate, disperse, forage, perform courtship and where some of them mate (Davy et al. 2017, Diehl et al. 2017). Nor does the Addendum give any consideration to the potential loss and fragmentation of aerohabitat, which is that portion of the aerosphere used by each species (Kunz et al. 2008), and usually within 1,000 feet of the ground. Although both the peregrine falcon and bats often take prey on the ground, these animals are known for taking prey largely on the wing. These animals hunt other volant wildlife, which means that both these hunters and their prey perform vital life functions and interact with each other within the aerosphere. As for nesting birds, there would be no nesting birds without the birds' access to the aerosphere. Despite the vital importance of the aerosphere to peregrine falcons, nesting birds, and to bats, the Addendum fails to recognize the aerosphere as essential habitat to volant wildlife.

The Addendum does recognize that the new buildings would pose barriers to movement and collision hazards to birds. At page 49, the Addendum warns, "Changes to building heights could result in new impacts on migratory species if they result in flight paths being obstructed, more bird strikes, or impacts on falcon nesting habitat." The Addendum then dismisses these potential impacts by citing the adoption in the Aesthetics section of the FEIR of planning code section 139's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings. However, there exist major logic problems with this purported solution. First, the standards for bird-safe buildings do not avoid the barrier effects of buildings, and in fact the strategic objective of bird-safe building guidelines is to increase the visibility of buildings as barriers to bird movement so that birds less often collide with the structural glass on the exteriors of the buildings. Second, the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, while meritorious as a first step toward reducing bird-window collision mortality, are of unmeasured efficacy. While it is great that the City adopted the Bird-Safe Guidelines, the City has yet to follow up with any study of whether or to what degree the Standards truly minimize or reduce bird-window collision mortality. In the face of this uncertainty, the additional 4,000 residential units, greater building heights, and revised spatial distribution could result in significantly larger numbers of collision fatalities compared to the 2022 plan, despite implementation of the City's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.

In my assessment, there are 147 special-status species of wildlife documented near enough to the project site to warrant a closer look at their occurrence likelihoods for the purpose of predicting potential project impacts (Table 1). Of these 147 special-status species, 14 are bats that, if they truly occur where construction would take place, would be at risk of losing aerohabitat in which they travel and forage. Another 112 special-status species of wildlife would be birds, 49 of which have been documented throughout the project area, eight of which are known to be centrally located, six are known to Golden Gate Park or Lake Merced, and 19 of which have been documented as generally

coastal. All these bird species would be vulnerable to collision mortality and greater expenditures of indispensable energy to negotiate the structural hazards of another 4,000 residential units and the reallocation of vertical building heights across the planning area.

All the birds represented in Table 1 can quickly fly from wherever they have been documented to any of the new buildings that would be part of the added project, so they would all be within brief flights to the proposed project's windows. At the California Academy of Sciences, the glass facades facing adjacent gardens killed 0.077 and 0.086 birds per $m^2$ of glass per year (Kahle et al. 2016), which might look like small numbers at first read, but which translate to large numbers of dead birds when projected to the extent of glass in the project (see below).

Window collisions are often characterized as either the second or third largest source or human-caused bird mortality. The numbers behind these characterizations are often attributed to Klem's (1990) and Dunn's (1993) estimates of about 100 million to 1 billion bird fatalities in the USA, or more recently by Loss et al.'s (2014) estimate of 365-988 million bird fatalities in the USA or Calvert et al.'s (2013) and Machtans et al.'s (2013) estimates of 22.4 million and 25 million bird fatalities in Canada, respectively. The proposed project would impose windows in the airspace normally used by birds.

Glass-façades of buildings intercept and kill many birds, but they are differentially hazardous to birds based on spatial extent, contiguity, orientation, and other factors. At Washington State University, Johnson and Hudson (1976) found 266 bird fatalities of 41 species within 73 months of monitoring of a three-story glass walkway (no fatality adjustments attempted). Prior to marking the windows to warn birds of the collision hazard, the collision rate was 84.7 per year. At that rate, and not attempting to adjust the fatality estimate for the proportion of fatalities not found, 4,574 birds were likely killed over the 54 years since the start of their study, and that's at a relatively small building façade. Accounting for the proportion of fatalities not found, the number of birds killed by this walkway over the last 54 years would have been about 14,270. And this is just for one 3-story, glass-sided walkway between two college campus buildings.

Klem's (1990) estimate was based on speculation that 1 to 10 birds are killed per building per year, and this speculated range was extended to the number of buildings estimated by the US Census Bureau in 1986. Klem's speculation was supported by fatality monitoring at only two houses, one in Illinois and the other in New York. Also, the basis of his fatality rate extension has changed greatly since 1986. Whereas his estimate served the need to alert the public of the possible magnitude of the bird-window collision issue, it was highly uncertain at the time and undoubtedly outdated more than three decades hence. Indeed, by 2010 Klem (2010) characterized the upper end of his estimated range – 1 billion bird fatalities – as conservative. Furthermore, the estimate lumped species together as if all birds are the same and the loss of all birds to windows has the same level of impact.

***Table 1.*** *Occurrence likelihoods of special-status bird species at or near the proposed project site, according to eBird/iNaturalist records (https://eBird.org, https://www.inaturalist.org) and on-site survey findings, where 'Very close' indicates within 1.5 miles of the site, "nearby" indicates within 1.5 and 4 miles, and "in region" indicates within 4 and 30 miles, and 'in range' means the species' geographic range overlaps the site.*

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status**[1] | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Bruno elfin butterfly | *Callophrys mossii bayensis* | FE | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Monarch | *Danaus plexippus* | FC | On site | Throughout |
| Bay checkerspot butterfly | *Euphydryas editha bayensis* | FT | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Mission blue butterfly | *Icaricia icarioides missionensis* | FE | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Callippe silverspot butterfly | *Speyeria callippe callippe* | FE | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Myrtle's silverspot butterfly | *Speyeria zerene myrtleae* | FE | In region | |
| Crotch's bumble bee | *Bombus crotchii* | CCE | In region | |
| Western bumble bee | *Bombus occidentalis* | CCE | Very close | |
| Longfin smelt | *Spirinchus thaleichthys* | CT | In region | |
| Delta Smelt | *Hypomesus transpacificus* | FT, CE | In region | |
| Tidewater goby | *Eucyclogobius newberryi* | FE, SSC | In region | iNat obscured points |
| California giant salamander | *Dicamptodon ensatus* | SSC | In region | Obscured |
| Foothill yellow-legged frog | *Rana boylii* | FT, CE | In region | |
| California red-legged frog | *Rana draytonii* | FT, SSC | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Green sea turtle | *Chelonia mydas* | FT | In region | |
| Northwestern pond turtle | *Actinemys marmorata* | FC, SSC | On site | West and SW |
| San Francisco garter snake | *Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia* | FE, CE, CFP | In region | iNat obscured points |
| Brant | *Branta bernicla* | SSC2 | On site | West and NE, along shores |
| Cackling goose (Aleutian) | *Branta hutchinsii leucopareia* | WL | On site | Generally throughout |
| Redhead | *Aythya americana* | SSC2 | On site | North |
| Harlequin duck | *Histrionicus histrionicus* | SSC2 | Very close | Presidio |
| Barrow's goldeneye | *Bucephala islandica* | SSC | On site | NW |
| Short-tailed albatross | *Phoebastria albatrus* | FE, SSC | In region | |
| Fork-tailed storm petrel | | SSC | Very close | North and west shores |
| Ashy storm-petrel | *Hydrobates homochroa* | BCC, SSC | Very close | Lake Merced |
| Black storm-petrel | *Hydrobates melania* | SSC, BCC | Very close | NW corner of peninsula |
| Western grebe | *Aechmophorus occidentalis* | BCC | On site | Throughout |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clark's grebe | *Aechmophorus clarkii* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Western yellow-billed cuckoo | *Coccyzus americanus occidentalis* | FT, CE | In region | |
| Black swift | *Cypseloides niger* | SSC3, BCC | On site | Central |
| Vaux's swift | *Chaetura vauxi* | SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Calliope hummingbird | *Selasphorus calliope* | BCC | On site | Central/South |
| Rufous hummingbird | *Selasphorus rufus* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Allen's hummingbird | *Selasphorus sasin* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Yellow rail | *Coturnicops noveboracensis* | BCC, SSC | In region | |
| Ridgway's rail (San Francisco Bay) | *Rallus obsoletus obsoletus* | FE, CE, CFP | On site | North |
| California black rail | | | In range | |
| Black oystercatcher | *Haematopus bachmani* | BCC | On site | Throughout, mostly shoreines |
| Mountain plover | *Charadrius montanus* | SSC2, BCC | Very close | San Francisco Zoo |
| Snowy plover | *Charadrius nivosus* | BCC | On site | North and west shores, 1 central |
| Western snowy plover | *Charadrius nivosus nivosus* | FT, SSC | Very close | West along shore |
| Long-billed curlew | *Numenius americanus* | WL | On site | Throughout |
| Marbled godwit | *Limosa fedoa* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Black turnstone | *Arenaria melanocephala* | BCC | On site | Mostly along north, west shores |
| Red knot (Pacific) | *Calidris canutus* | BCC | On site | West along coast |
| Pectoral sandpiper | *Calidris melanotos* | BCC | Very close | Lake Merced and Presidio |
| Short-billed dowitcher | *Limnodromus griseus* | BCC | On site | West, North, and central |
| Wandering tattler | *Tringa incana* | BCC | On site | North and W, mostly shores |
| Lesser yellowlegs | *Tringa flavipes* | BCC | On site | North /central (Richmond) |
| Willet | *Tringa semipalmata* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Marbled murrelet | *Brachyramphus marmoratus* | FT, CE | On site | West and N/central (Richmond) |
| Rhinoceros auklet | *Cerorhinca monocerata* | WL | On site | North and W, along shores |
| Cassin's auklet | *Ptychoramphus aleuticus* | SSC | Very close | North and W of along shores |
| Scripps' murrelet | *Synthliboramphus scrippsi* | CT, BCC | Very close | NW of site along shore |
| Tufted puffin | | | Very close | West along shore |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laughing gull | *Leucophaeus atricilla* | WL | Very close | Presidio, West shore, Lake Merced |
| Franklin's gull | *Leucophaeus pipixcan* | BCC | Very close | West shore, Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced |
| Heermann's gull | *Larus heermanni* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Western gull | *Larus occidentalis* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| California gull | *Larus californicus* | BCC, WL | On site | Throughout |
| California least tern | *Sternula antillarum browni* | FE, CE, CFP | Very close | North and Lake Merced |
| Black tern | *Chlidonias niger* | SSC2, BCC | Very close | Golden Gate Park, North and west aspects |
| Elegant tern | *Thalasseus elegans* | BCC, WL | On site | Throughout |
| Black skimmer | *Rynchops niger* | BCC, SSC3 | On site | North shore |
| Common loon | *Gavia immer* | SSC | On site | Throughout |
| Brandt's cormorant | *Urile penicillatus* | BCC | On site | Throughout, mostly along North and west shores |
| Double-crested cormorant | *Phalacrocorax auritus* | WL | On site | Throughout |
| American white pelican | *Pelacanus erythrorhynchos* | SSC1 | On site | Throughout, mostly North, central |
| Least bittern | *Ixobrychus exilis* | SSC2 | Very close | Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced |
| White-faced ibis | *Plegadis chihi* | WL | On site | West side |
| Turkey vulture | *Cathartes aura* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Osprey | *Pandion haliaetus* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| White-tailed kite | *Elanus luecurus* | CFP, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Golden eagle | *Aquila chrysaetos* | BGEPA, CFP, BOP, WL | On site | Throughout, mostly central |
| Northern harrier | *Circus cyaneus* | BCC, SSC3, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Sharp-shinned hawk | *Accipiter striatus* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Cooper's hawk | *Accipiter cooperii* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| American goshawk | *Accipiter atricapillus* | SSC2, BOP | On site | North |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bald eagle | *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* | CE, BGEPA, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Red-shouldered hawk | *Buteo lineatus* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Swainson's hawk | *Buteo swainsoni* | CT, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Red-tailed hawk | *Buteo jamaicensis* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Ferruginous hawk | *Buteo regalis* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Rough-legged hawk | *Buteo lagopus* | BOP | On site | Central |
| American barn owl | *Tyto furcata* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Northern spotted owl | *Strix occidentalis caurina* | FT, CT, BOP | In range | |
| Western screech-owl | *Megascops kennicotti* | BOP | Very close | Presidio, Golden Gate Park |
| Great horned owl | *Bubo virginianus* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Burrowing owl | *Athene cunicularia* | BCC, SSC2, BOP, CCE | On site | Throughout |
| Long-eared owl | *Asio otus* | BCC, SSC3, BOP | In region | |
| Short-eared owl | *Asia flammeus* | BCC, SSC3, BOP | On site | Central |
| Northern saw-whet owl | *Aegolius acadicus* | BOP | On site | North |
| Northern pygmy-owl | *Glaucidium gnoma* | BOP | Very close | Lake Merced |
| Lewis's woodpecker | *Melanerpes lewis* | BCC | On site | North and central |
| Nuttall's woodpecker | *Picoides nuttallii* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| American kestrel | *Falco sparverius* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Merlin | *Falco columbarius* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Peregrine falcon | *Falco peregrinus* | BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Prairie falcon | *Falco mexicanus* | WL, BOP | On site | Throughout |
| Olive-sided flycatcher | *Contopus cooperi* | BCC, SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Willow flycatcher | *Empidonax trailii* | CE | On site | Throughout |
| Vermilion flycatcher | *Pyrocephalus rubinus* | SSC2 | On site | North /central (Richmond) |
| Least Bell's vireo | *Vireo bellii pusillus* | FE, CE | In region | |
| Loggerhead shrike | *Lanius ludovicianus* | SSC2 | Very close | Presidio, Lake Merced, Golden Gate Park, SE of site |

| **Common name** | ***Species name*** | **Status[1]** | **Occurrence records** | **Locations of On-site and Very-close records** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yellow-billed magpie | *Pica nuttalli* | BCC | On site | Central/South |
| Oak titmouse | *Baeolophus inornatus* | BCC | On site | North and central |
| California horned lark | *Eremophila alpestris actia* | WL | On site | North and central |
| Bank swallow | *Riparia riparia* | CT | On site | Throughout |
| Purple martin | *Progne subis* | SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Wrentit | *Chamaea fasciata* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| California thrasher | *Toxostoma redivivum* | BCC | On site | N and central |
| Cassin's finch | *Haemorhous cassinii* | BCC | On site | N and central |
| Lawrence's goldfinch | *Spinus lawrencei* | BCC | On site | N and central |
| Grasshopper sparrow | *Ammodramus savannarum* | SSC2 | On site | N and central |
| Black-chinned sparrow | *Spizella atrogularis* | BCC | In region | |
| Bell's sparrow | *Amphispiza b. belli* | WL | On site | South |
| Large-billed savannah sparrow | *Passerculus sandwichensis rostratus* | SSC2 | In region | |
| Yellow-breasted chat | *Icteria virens* | SSC3 | On site | Throughout |
| Yellow-headed blackbird | *Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus* | SSC3 | On site | North and central |
| Bullock's oriole | *Icterus bullockii* | BCC | On site | Throughout |
| Tricolored blackbird | *Agelaius tricolor* | CT, BCC, SSC1 | On site | Throughout |
| Lucy's warbler | *Leiothlypis luciae* | SSC3 | On site | SW and North |
| Virginia's warbler | *Leiothlypis virginiae* | WL, BCC | On site | Throughout |
| San Francisco common yellowthroat | *Geothlypis trichas sinuosa* | SSC3, BCC | In range | |
| Prothonotary warbler | *Protonotaria citrea* | BCC | On site | Central and West |
| Prairie warbler | *Setophaga discolor* | BCC | On site | Central |
| Yellow warbler | *Setophaga petechia* | SSC2 | On site | Throughout |
| Hepatic tanager | *Piranga flava* | WL | On site | Central/South |
| Summer tanager | *Piranga rubra* | SSC1 | On site | Throughout |
| Little brown bat | *Myotis lucifugus* | WBWG: M | In region | |
| Yuma myotis | *Myotis yumanensis* | WBWG: LM | Very close | In golden gate park |

| Common name | *Species name* | Status[1] | Occurrence records | Locations of On-site and Very-close records |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Long-eared myotis | *Myotis evotis* | WBWG: M | In region | |
| Fringed myotis | *Myotis thysanodes* | WBWG: H | In range | |
| Long-legged myotis | *Myotis volans* | WBWG: H | In range | |
| California myotis | *Myotis californicus* | WBWG:L | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Canyon bat | *Parastrellus hesperus* | WBWG: M | In range | |
| Big brown bat | *Episticus fuscus* | WBWG: L | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Silver-haired bat | *Lasionycteris noctivagans* | WBWG: M | On site | North |
| Hoary bat | *Lasiurus cinereus* | WBWG: M | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Western red bat | *Lasiurus blossevillii* | SSC, WBWG: H | Very close | In golden gate park |
| Townsend's big-eared bat | *Corynorhinus townsendii* | SSC, WBWG: H | In region | |
| Pallid bat | *Antrozous pallidus* | SSC, WBWG: H | In region | |
| Mexican free-tailed bat | *Tadarida brasiliensis* | WBWG: L | Very close | Golden Gate Park |
| San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat | *Neotoma fuscipes annectens* | SSC | In region | |
| Southern sea otter | *nhydra lutris nereis* | FT, CFP, SSC | In region | |
| Salt-marsh harvest mouse | *Reithrodontomys raviventris* | FE, CE, CFP | In region | |
| American badger | *Taxidea taxus* | SSC | Nearby | |

[1] Listed on CDFW's Special Animals List (https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=109406) as FT or FE = federal threatened or endangered; FC = federal candidate for listing; BGEPA = Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act; CT or CE = California threatened or endangered; CCT or CCE = Candidate California threatened or endangered; CFP = California Fully Protected (California Fish and Game Code 3511); SSC = California Species of Special Concern, and SSC1, SSC2 and SSC3 = California Bird Species of Special Concern priorities 1, 2 and 3, respectively); WL = CDFW's Taxa to Watch List; WBWG = Western Bat Working Group with priority rankings, of low (L), moderate (M), and high (H); BCC = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Bird of Conservation Concern (https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/birds-of-conservation-concern-2021.pdf); and BOP = protected by Birds of Prey (California Fish and Game Code 3503.5, see https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Birds/Raptors).

By the time Loss et al. (2014) performed their effort to estimate annual USA bird-window fatalities, many more fatality monitoring studies had been reported or were underway. Loss et al. (2014) incorporated many more fatality rates based on scientific monitoring, and they were more careful about which fatality rates to include. However, they included estimates based on fatality monitoring by homeowners, which in one study were found to detect only 38% of the available window fatalities (Bracey et al. 2016). Loss et al. (2014) excluded all fatality records lacking a dead bird in hand, such as injured birds or feather or blood spots on windows. Loss et al.'s (2014) fatality metric was the number of fatalities per building (where in this context a building can include a house, low-rise, or high-rise structure), but they assumed that this metric was based on window collisions. Because most of the bird-window collision studies were limited to migration seasons, Loss et al. (2014) developed an admittedly assumption-laden correction factor for making annual estimates. Also, only 2 of the studies included adjustments for carcass persistence and searcher detection error, and it was unclear how and to what degree fatality rates were adjusted for these factors. Although Loss et al. (2014) attempted to account for some biases as well as for large sources of uncertainty mostly resulting from an opportunistic rather than systematic sampling data source, their estimated annual fatality rate across the USA was highly uncertain and vulnerable to multiple biases, most of which would have resulted in fatality estimates biased low.

In my review of bird-window collision monitoring, I found that the search radius around homes and buildings was very narrow, usually 2 meters. Based on my experience with bird collisions in other contexts, I would expect that a large portion of bird-window collision victims would end up farther than 2 m from the windows, especially when the windows are higher up on tall buildings. In my experience, searcher detection rates tend to be low for small birds deposited on ground with vegetation cover or woodchips or other types of organic matter. Also, vertebrate scavengers entrain on anthropogenic sources of mortality and quickly remove many of the carcasses, thereby preventing the fatality searcher from detecting these fatalities. Adjusting fatality rates for these factors – search radius bias, searcher detection error, and carcass persistence rates – would greatly increase nationwide estimates of bird-window collision fatalities.

Buildings can intercept many nocturnal migrants as well as birds flying in daylight. As mentioned above, Johnson and Hudson (1976) found 266 bird fatalities of 41 species within 73 months of monitoring of a four-story glass walkway at Washington State University (no adjustments attempted for undetected fatalities). Somerlot (2003) found 21 bird fatalities among 13 buildings on a university campus within only 61 days. Monitoring twice per week, Hager at al. (2008) found 215 bird fatalities of 48 species, or 55 birds/building/year, and at another site they found 142 bird fatalities of 37 species for 24 birds/building/year. Gelb and Delacretaz (2009) recorded 5,400 bird fatalities under buildings in New York City, based on a decade of monitoring only during migration periods, and some of the high-rises were associated with hundreds of fatalities each. Klem et al. (2009) monitored 73 building façades in New York City during 114 days of two migratory periods, tallying 549 collision victims, nearly 5 birds per day. Borden et al. (2010) surveyed a 1.8 km route 3 times per week during 12-month period and found 271 bird fatalities of 50 species. Parkins et al. (2015) found 35 bird fatalities of 16 species within only 45 days of monitoring under 4 building façades. From

24 days of survey over a 48-day span, Porter and Huang (2015) found 47 fatalities under 8 buildings on a university campus. Sabo et al. (2016) found 27 bird fatalities over 61 days of searches under 31 windows. In San Francisco, Kahle et al. (2016) found 355 collision victims within 1,762 days under a 5-story building. Ocampo-Peñuela et al. (2016) searched the perimeters of 6 buildings on a university campus, finding 86 fatalities after 63 days of surveys. One of these buildings produced 61 of the 86 fatalities, and another building with collision-deterrent glass caused only 2 of the fatalities, thereby indicating a wide range in impacts likely influenced by various factors. There is ample evidence available to support my prediction that the proposed project would result in many collision fatalities of birds.

Project Impact Prediction

By the time of these comments, I had reviewed and processed results of bird collision monitoring at 213 buildings and façades for which bird collisions per $m^2$ of glass per year could be calculated and averaged (Johnson and Hudson 1976, O'Connell 2001, Somerlot 2003, Hager et al. 2008, Borden et al. 2010, Hager et al. 2013, Porter and Huang 2015, Parkins et al. 2015, Kahle et al. 2016, Ocampo-Peñuela et al. 2016, Sabo et al. 2016, Barton et al. 2017, Gomez-Moreno et al. 2018, Schneider et al. 2018, Loss et al. 2019, Brown et al. 2020, City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Audubon 2020, Riding et al. 2020). These study results averaged 0.073 bird deaths per $m^2$ of glass per year (95% CI: 0.042-0.102). This average and its 95% confidence interval provide a robust basis for predicting fatality rates at a proposed new project.

The Addendum includes an increase of 4,000 residential units. The floorspace per residential unit of condominiums, townhouses and apartments among the projects I have reviewed as an expert have averaged 1,296.3 square feet per unit. The average square footage of the apartments that contributed to this average was consistent with the floorspace reported in the Addendum as an example 590-foot-tall apartment building in the project, which itself would average 949 sf per unit with 60,700 sf of retail space. I estimate the total square footage of 4,000 residential units would be 5,185,251 sf.

Among the 45 residential projects I have reviewed as an expert and for which I was able to measure the extent of structural glass on proposed building facades depicted in renderings provided in the environmental review documents, I measured an average 0.01872 (95% confidence interval: 0.00989–0.02754) $m^2$ per square foot of floorspace. This rate multiplied by the total square footage of 4,000 additional residential units would predict 97,060 (95% CI: 51,300–142,821) $m^2$ of additional structural glass on the facades of new buildings in the City. The mean window area multiplied against the mean collision mortality measured across North America predicts 7,095 (aggregate[1] 95% CI: 2,226–14,82) bird fatalities per year. More than seven thousand additional fatalities per

[1] What I mean by aggregate CI is that the lower bound estimate of the window area is multiplied by the lower bound estimate of collision mortality, and the upper bound estimate of the window area is multiplied by the upper bound estimate of collision mortality.

year above the level that would be expected under the 2022 plan would be a substantial number, and it should easily qualify as a highly significant impact.

Nearly all predicted deaths would be of birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and under the California Migratory Bird Protection Act, thus causing significant impacts. Given the predicted level of bird-window collision mortality, it is my opinion that the proposed project would result in potentially significant adverse biological impacts, including the unmitigated take of aerial habitats of birds, bats and other volant wildlife. Not only would the project take habitat of rare and sensitive species of birds, but it would transform the building's airspace into a lethal collision trap to birds.

## SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF PREDICTED AVIAN COLLISION MORTALITY

San Francisco is situated within the Pacific Flyway, which is one of the most intensely used bird migration pathways in the world. It is also known that birds migrate along the coast and across Hawk Hill and the Marin Headlands, many headed to or from the Altamont Pass where I spent thousands of hours observing migrants during both day and night over about 20 years. Between Hawk Hill and the Altamont Pass is San Francisco, which must be visited by many thousands of migrating birds. Knowing which species of birds and how many birds move across San Francisco, and knowing specific flight paths that are disproportionately used by season would be useful for predicting where increases in building heights would pose greater risks to birds. Unfortunately, the data on bird movement through San Francisco are sparse.

There *are* data on bird species richness. Golden Gate Audubon Society ("GGAS") (2020), tallied 47 species of birds on Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve in about 54 hours of surveys between 16 March and 29 December 2019. On the same Reserve on 20 August 2020, I detected 23 species of birds over a much shorter time, but a model I fit to my data predicts that I would have detected the same number of bird species as GGAS (2020) had I surveyed for 11 hours and 40 minutes, and that I would have detected 117 species of birds had I surveyed for 54 hours (Figure 1).

I repeated my survey on Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve on 16 July 2021, and I implemented the same survey methods such as start time, duration, and survey route. The second survey yielded even more species detections and at a faster rate (red circles in Figure 2). Between both surveys I detected 37 species of birds, but adding the results of GGAS (2021) brings the total number of bird species to 71. With additional surveys, this number would surely increase. The evidence is that many birds find and use aerohabitat in San Francisco.

Kahle et al. (2016) detected 40 species of birds at the California Academy of Sciences building in Golden Gatee Park (Table 2). More importantly, members of 34 (85%) of these species were also recorded as window collision fatalities, and members of 37 (93%) of these species appear in the scientific literature as window collision fatalities. Killed disproportionately relative to their observed abundances were special-status species such as Allen's hummingbird and yellow warbler (Figure 3). Both these species are found in abundance in San Francisco (Photo 1).

***Figure 1.*** *Cumulative number of bird species detected as a power function of the number of minutes devoted to the survey. The model explained 98% of the variation, with a root mean square error of 17.71. Had I been able to commit more time to the survey, I am confident a different model would have better fit the resulting data – a model more expressive of an asymptote.*




***Figure 2.*** *Actual and predicted relationships between the number of vertebrate wildlife species (all but 2 were birds) detected and the elapsed survey time based on my visual-scan surveys on 20 August 2020 and 16 July 2021.*

$$Y_{2020} = \frac{1}{0.001559 + 0.935847(X+1)^{-0.580731}}$$

$$Y_{2021} = \frac{1}{0.0016586 + 0.459981(X+1)^{-0.543857}}$$



***Table 2.*** *Species observed on site or reported as window-collision victims at the California Academy of Sciences (CAS) buildings (Kahle et al. 2016).*

| Species | Scientific name | Status[1] | Number counted at CAS study | | Known window deaths in North America |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | As window deaths | Alive in survey plots | |
| Western gull | *Larus occidentalis* | BCC | | 4 | |
| Red-tailed hawk | *Buteo jamaicensis* | BOP | | 1 | Yes |
| Red-shouldered hawk | *Buteo lineatus* | BOP | | 1 | Yes |
| Mourning dove | *Zenaida macroura* | | 6 | 3 | Yes |
| Great-horned owl | *Bubo virginianus* | BOP | | 1 | Yes |
| Anna's hummingbird | *Calypte anna* | | 131 | 256 | Yes |
| Allen's hummingbird | *Selasphorus sasin* | BCC | 37 | 29 | Yes |
| Costa's hummingbird | *Calypte costae* | BCC | 1 | 0 | Yes |
| Rufous hummingbird | *Selasphorus rufus* | BCC | 4 | 0 | Yes |
| Nuttall's woodpecker | *Picoides nuttallii* | BCC | | 13 | |
| Pacific-slope flycatcher | *Empidonax difficilis* | | 1 | 5 | Yes |
| Black phoebe | *Sayornis nigricans* | | 3 | 34 | Yes |
| Chestnut-backed chickadee | *Poecile rufescens* | | 1 | 203 | Yes |
| Bushtit | *Psaltriparus minimus* | | 1 | 399 | Yes |
| Brown creeper | *Certhia americana* | | 1 | 52 | Yes |
| Pygmy nuthatch | *Sitta pygmaea* | | 1 | 242 | Yes |
| Swainson's thrush | *Catharus ustulatus* | | 1 | 1 | Yes |
| Hermit thrush | *Catharus guttatus* | | 8 | 82 | Yes |
| American robin | *Turdus vulvaris* | | 3 | 389 | Yes |
| Warbling vireo | *Vireo gilvus* | | 1 | 5 | Yes |
| Yellow-rumped warbler | *Setophaga coronata* | | 7 | 92 | Yes |
| Orange-crowned warbler | *Oreothlypis celata* | | 2 | 29 | Yes |
| Townsend's warbler | *Setophaga townsendi* | | 3 | 101 | Yes |
| Wilson's warbler | *Cardellina pusilla* | | 3 | 11 | Yes |
| Yellow warbler | *Setophaga petechia* | SSC2, BCC | 7 | 18 | Yes |
| San Francisco common yellowthroat | *Geothlypis trichas sinuosa* | SSC3, BCC | 3 | 0 | Yes |
| Song sparrow | *Melospiza melodia* | | 5 | 435 | Yes |
| Golden-crowned sparrow | *Zonotrichia atricapilla* | | 3 | 230 | Yes |
| White-crowned sparrow | *Zonotrichia leucophrys* | | 1 | 249 | Yes |
| Savannah sparrow | *Passerculus sandwichensis* | | 2 | 0 | Yes |
| Lincoln's sparrow | *Melospiza lincolnii* | | 3 | 35 | Yes |
| Fox sparrow | *Passerella iliaca* | | 6 | 152 | Yes |

| Species | Scientific name | Status[1] | Number counted at CAS study | | Known window deaths in North America |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | As window deaths | Alive in survey plots | |
| Dark-eyed junco | *Junco hyemalis* | | 22 | 510 | Yes |
| California towhee | *Melozone crissalis* | | 1 | 92 | Yes |
| Brown-headed cowbird | *Molothrus ater* | | 1 | 39 | Yes |
| Red-winged blackbird | *Agelaius phoeniceus* | | 1 | 261 | Yes |
| Brewer's blackbird | *Euphagus cyanocephalus* | | 25 | 1027 | Yes |
| Tricolored blackbird | *Agelaius tricolor* | CT, BCC | | 15 | |
| House finch | *Haemorhous mexicanus* | | 5 | 213 | Yes |
| Lesser goldfinch | *Spinus psaltria* | | 1 | 44 | Yes |

[1] Listed as BCC = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bird Species of Conservation Concern, CT = California threatened, BOP = California Fish and Game Code 3503.5 (Birds of Prey), and SSC1, SSC2 and SSC3 = California Bird Species of Special Concern priorities 1, 2 and 3, respectively.

***Figure 3.*** *Window collision fatalities as a proportion of those observed in visual-scan surveys at the California Academy of Sciences building (data from Kahle et al. 2016).*



***Photo 1.*** *Allen's hummingbird in Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve, 16 July 2021. As found at the nearby California Academy of Sciences Building, this species is highly vulnerable to window collision mortality (Kahle et al. 2016).*

What is needed is a study of bird movement through San Francisco. Needed are data on species occurrences, numbers of birds, heights above ground, flight direction, specific behaviors and timing of flights across the City. These same types of data were collected in the nearby Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area to acquire an understanding of bird flight traffic for the purposed of guiding the sitings of new wind turbines as part of repowering (Smallwood 2017, Smallwood et al. 2017). The data could be acquired by performing periodic surveys from stations established systematically or randomly across the City, covering all times of day and night (using thermal imaging cameras) and lasting at least one year to characterize seasonality of bird movement. Based on such data, the City could more carefully plan the vertical and lateral outlay of new buildings to minimize the encounter frequencies of birds with buildings. This is important because the existing Bird-Safe Building Guidelines can accomplish only so much, and the efficacy of these Guidelines remains unmeasured and unknown. Therefore, what is also needed is a program to measure the efficacy of the Guidelines by designing an experiment to search for and count bird-window collision victims along with the implementation of carcass detection trials. The San Francisco guidelines should have also covered scientific monitoring of impacts as well as compensatory mitigation for impacts that could not be avoided, minimized or reduced. Until these types of bird movement data are in hand, the City can only speculate as to the magnitude of bird-window collision mortality and whether the mortality can be minimized or reduced via Bird-Safe Building Guidelines.

In the face of such a large increase in the number of residential units, as well as a major shift in the lateral and vertical layout of 54,000 residential units, another need is for an update in the Bird-Safe Building Guidelines (San Francisco Planning Department 2011). Much has been learned about causal factors and mitigation solutions (e.g., Sheppard and Phillips 2015). The American Bird Conservancy (ABC) produced an excellent set of

guidelines recommending actions to: (1) Minimize use of glass; (2) Placing glass behind some type of screening (grilles, shutters, exterior shades); (3) Using glass with inherent properties to reduce collisions, such as patterns, window films, decals or tape; and (4) Turning off lights during migration seasons (Sheppard and Phillips 2015).

New research results inform of the efficacy of marking windows. Whereas Klem (1990) found no deterrent effect from decals on windows, Johnson and Hudson (1976) reported a fatality reduction of about 69% after placing decals on windows. In an experiment of opportunity, Ocampo-Peñuela et al. (2016) found only 2 of 86 fatalities at one of 6 buildings – the only building with windows treated with a bird deterrent film. At the building with fritted glass, bird collisions were 82% lower than at other buildings with untreated windows. Kahle et al. (2016) added external window shades to some windowed façades to reduce fatalities 82% and 95%. Brown et al. (2020) reported an 84% lower collision probability among fritted glass windows and windows treated with ORNILUX R UV. City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Audubon (2020) reduced bird collision fatalities 94% by affixing marked Solyx window film to existing glass panels of Portland's Columbia Building. Many external and internal glass markers have been tested experimentally, some showing no effect and some showing strong deterrent effects (Klem 1989, 1990, 2009, 2011; Klem and Saenger 2013; Rössler et al. 2015).

Van Doren et al. (2021) found that nocturnal migrants contributed most of the collision fatalities in their study, and the largest predictors of fatalities were peak migration and lit windows. Van Doren et al. (2021) predicted that a light-out mitigation measure could reduce bird-window collision mortality by 60%.

Monitoring and the use of compensatory mitigation should be incorporated at any new building project because the measures recommended in the available guidelines remain of uncertain efficacy, and even if these measures are effective, they will not reduce collision fatalities to zero. The only way to assess mitigation efficacy and to quantify post-construction fatalities is to monitor the project for fatalities.

The Addendum (p. 49) concludes, "In summary, the proposed rezoning program would not result in new significant biological resources impacts that were not previously identified in the FEIR, nor would it result in more severe impacts than those previously identified. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are required." However, the FEIR did not identify the loss of aerohabitat of birds and bats as any sort of project impact, and neither does the Addendum. Furthermore, the FEIR did not identify as an impact my predicted mean mortality of 7,095 birds per year just from the additional 4,000 residential units, and an upper bound CI prediction of 14,082 birds per year.

Thank you for your consideration,

Shawn Smallwood, Ph.D.

## LITERATURE CITED


Barton, C. M., C. S. Riding, and S. R. Loss. 2017. Magnitude and correlates of bird collisions at glass bus shelters in an urban landscape. Plos One 12. (6): e0178667. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178667

Basilio, L. G., D. J. Moreno, and A, J. Piratelli. 2020. Main causes of bird-window collisions: a review. Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências 92(1): e20180745 DOI 10.1590/0001-3765202020180745.

Borden, W. C., O. M. Lockhart, A. W. Jones, and M. S. Lyons. 2010. Seasonal, taxonomic, and local habitat components of bird-window collisions on an urban university campus in Cleveland, OH. Ohio Journal of Science 110(3):44-52.

Bracey, A. M., M. A. Etterson, G. J. Niemi, and R. F. Green. 2016. Variation in bird-window collision mortality and scavenging rates within an urban landscape. The Wilson Journal of Ornithology 128:355-367.

Brown, B. B., L. Hunter, and S. Santos. 2020. Bird-window collisions: different fall and winter risk and protective factors. PeerJ 8:e9401 http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.9401

City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Audubon. 2020. Collisions at the Columbia Building: A synthesis of pre- and post-retrofit monitoring. Environmental Services of City of Portland, Oregon.

Davy, C. M., A. T. Ford, and K. C. Fraser. 2017. Aeroconservation for the fragmented skies. Conservation Letters 10(6): 773–780.

De Groot, K. L., A. G. Wilson, R. McKibbin, S. A. Hudson, K. M. Dohms, A. R. Norris, A. C. Huang, I. B. J. Whitehorne, K. T. Fort, C. Roy, J. Bourque, and S. Wilson. 2022. Bird protection treatments reduce bird-window collision risk at low-rise buildings within a Pacific coastal protected area. PeerJ 10(9):e13142 DOI 10.7717/peerj.13142.

Diehl, R. H., A. C. Peterson, R. T. Bolus, and D. Johnson. 2017. Extending the habitat concept to the airspace. USGS Staff -- Published Research. 1129. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usgsstaffpub/1129

Dunn, E. H. 1993. Bird mortality from striking residential windows in winter. Journal of Field Ornithology 64:302-309.

Gelb, Y. and N. Delacretaz. 2009. Windows and vegetation: Primary factors in Manhattan bird collisions. Northeastern Naturalist 16:455-470.

GGAS (Golden Gate Audubon Society). 2020. UCSF Mount Sutro Open Space Preserve bird monitoring survey preliminary report from survey data collected March-December 2019. Report to University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

GGAS (Golden Gate Audubon Society). 2021. UCSF Mount Sutro Open Space Preserve Bird and Lepidoptera monitoring survey report from survey data collected January-December 2020 and March-December 2019. Report to University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

Gómez-Moreno, V. del C., J. R. Herrera-Herrera, and S. Niño-Maldonado. 2018. Bird collisions in windows of Centro Universitario Victoria, Tamaulipas, México. Huitzil, Revista Mexicana de Ornitología 19(2): 227-236. https://doi.org/10.28947/hrmo.2018.19.2.347

Hager, S. B., H. Trudell, K. J. McKay, S. M. Crandall, and L. Mayer. 2008. Bird density and mortality at windows. Wilson Journal of Ornithology 120:550-564.

Hager S. B., B. J. Cosentino, K J. McKay, C. Monson, W. Zuurdeeg, and B. Blevins. 2013. Window area and development drive spatial variation in bird-window collisions in an urban landscape. PLoS ONE 8(1): e53371. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0053371

Johnson, R. E., and G. E. Hudson. 1976. Bird mortality at a glassed-in walkway in Washington State. Western Birds 7:99-107.

Kahle, L. Q., M. E. Flannery, and J. P. Dumbacher. 2016. Bird-window collisions at a west-coast urban park museum: analyses of bird biology and window attributes from Golden Gate Park, San Francisco. PLoS ONE 11(1):e144600 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0144600.

Klem, D., Jr. 1989. Bird-window collisions. Wilson Bulletin 101:606-620.

Klem, D., Jr. 1990. Collisions between birds and windows: mortality and prevention. Journal of Field Ornithology 61:120-128.

Klem, D., Jr. 2009. Preventing bird-window collisions. The Wilson Journal of Ornithology 121:314-321.

Klem, D., Jr. 2011. Evaluating the effectiveness of Acopian Birdsavers to deter or prevent bird-glass collisions. Unpublished report.

Klem, D., Jr. and P. G. Saenger. 2013. Evaluating the effectiveness of select visual signals to prevent bird-window collisions. The Wilson Journal of Ornithology 125:406–411.

Kunz, T. H., S. A. Gauthreaux Jr., N. I. Hristov, J. W. Horn, G. Jones, E. K. V. Kalko, R. P. Larkin, G. F. McCracken, S. M. Swartz, R. B. Srygley, R. Dudley, J. K. Westbrook, and M. Wikelski. 2008. Aeroecology: probing and modelling the aerosphere. Integrative and Comparative Biology 48:1-11. doi:10.1093/icb/icn037

Loss, S. R., T. Will, S. S. Loss, and P. P. Marra. 2014. Bird–building collisions in the United States: Estimates of annual mortality and species vulnerability. The Condor: Ornithological Applications 116:8-23. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-13-090.1

Loss, S. R., S. Lao, J. W. Eckles, A. W. Anderson, R. B. Blair, and R. J. Turner. 2019. Factors influencing bird-building collisions in the downtown area of a major North American city. PLoS ONE 14(11): e0224164. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224164

Machtans, C. S., C. H. R. Wedeles, and E. M. Bayne. 2013. A first estimate for Canada of the number of birds killed by colliding with building windows. Avian Conservation and Ecology 8(2):6. http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ACE-00568-080206

Ocampo-Peñuela, N., R. S. Winton, C. J. Wu, E. Zambello, T. W. Wittig and N. L. Cagle . 2016. Patterns of bird-window collisions inform mitigation on a university campus. PeerJ4:e1652;DOI10.7717/peerj.1652

O'Connell, T. J. 2001. Avian window strike mortality at a suburban office park. The Raven 72:141-149.

Parkins, K. L., S. B. Elbin, and E. Barnes. 2015. Light, glass, and bird–building collisions in an urban park. Northeastern Naturalist 22:84-94.

Porter, A., and A. Huang. 2015. Bird collisions with glass: UBC pilot project to assess bird collision rates in Western North America. UBC Social Ecological Economic Development Studies (SEEDS) Student Report. Report to Environment Canada, UBC SEEDS and UBC BRITE.

Riding, C. S., T. J. O'Connell, and S. R. Loss. 2020. Building façade-level correlates of bird–window collisions in a small urban area. The Condor: Ornithological Applications 122:1–14.

Riggs, G. J., C. M. Barton, C. S. Riding, T. J. O'Connell1, and S. R. Loss. 2023. Field-testing effectiveness of window markers in reducing bird-window collisions. Urban Ecosystems (2023) 26:713–723. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-022-01304-w

Rosenberg, K. V., A. M. Dokter, P. J. Blancher, J. R. Sauer, A. C. Smith, P. A. Smith, J. C. Stanton, A. Panjabi , L. Helft , M. Parr, and P. P. Marra. 2019. Decline of the North American avifauna. Science 10.1126/science.aaw1313 (2019).

Rössler, M., E. Nemeth, and A. Bruckner. 2015. Glass pane markings to prevent bird-window collisions: less can be more. Biologia 70: 535—541. DOI: 10.1515/biolog-2015-0057

Sabo, A. M., N. D. G. Hagemeyer, A. S. Lahey, and E. L. Walters. 2016. Local avian density influences risk of mortality from window strikes. PeerJ 4:e2170; DOI 10.7717/peerj.2170

San Francisco Planning Department. 2011. Standards for bird-safe buildings. San Francisco Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco, California.

Schneider, R. M., C. M. Barton, K. W. Zirkle, C. F. Greene, and K. B. Newman. 2018. Year-round monitoring reveals prevalence of fatal bird-window collisions at the Virginia Tech Corporate Research Center. *PeerJ* 6:e4562 https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4562

Sheppard, C., and G. Phillips. 2015. Bird-friendly building design, 2nd Ed., American Bird Conservancy, The Plains, Virginia.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. Monitoring birds. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Smallwood, K. S., and N. L. Smallwood. 2023. Measured effects of anthropogenic development on vertebrate wildlife diversity. Diversity 15, 1037. https://doi.org/10.3390/d15101037.

Smallwood, K. S., L. Neher, and D. A. Bell. 2017. Siting to Minimize Raptor Collisions: an example from the Repowering Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Somerlot, K. E. 2003. Survey of songbird mortality due to window collisions on the Murray State University campus. Journal of Service Learning in Conservation Biology 1:1–19.

Swaddle, J. P., B. Brewster, M. Schuyler, and A. Su. 2023. Window films increase avoidance of collisions by birds but only when applied to external compared with internal surfaces of windows. PeerJ 11:e14676 http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.14676

Van Doren, B. M., D. E. Willardb, M. Hennenb, K. G. Hortonc, E. F. Stubera, D. Sheldond, A. H. Sivakumare, J. Wanga, A. Farnswortha, and B. M. Winger. 2021. Drivers of fatal bird collisions in an urban center. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118 (24). e2101666118

# Kenneth Shawn Smallwood
# Curriculum Vitae

3108 Finch Street
Davis, CA 95616
Phone (530) 756-4598
Cell (530) 601-6857
puma@dcn.org

Born May 3, 1963 in Sacramento, California.
Married, father of two.

## Ecologist

### Expertise

- Finding solutions to controversial problems related to wildlife interactions with human industry, infrastructure, and activities;
- Wildlife monitoring and field study using GPS, thermal imaging, behavior surveys;
- Using systems analysis and experimental design principles to identify meaningful ecological patterns that inform management decisions.

### Education

Ph.D. Ecology, University of California, Davis. September 1990.
M.S. Ecology, University of California, Davis. June 1987.
B.S. Anthropology, University of California, Davis. June 1985.
Corcoran High School, Corcoran, California. June 1981.

### Experience

- 762 professional reports, including:
- 90 peer reviewed publications
- 24 in non-reviewed proceedings
- 646 reports, declarations, posters and book reviews
- 8 in mass media outlets
- 92 public presentations of research results

Editing for scientific journals: Guest Editor, *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 2012-2013, of invited papers representing international views on the impacts of wind energy on wildlife and how to mitigate the impacts. Associate Editor, *Journal of Wildlife Management*, March 2004 to 30 June 2007. Editorial Board Member, *Environmental Management*, 10/1999 to 8/2004. Associate Editor, *Biological Conservation*, 9/1994 to 9/1995.

Member, Alameda County Scientific Review Committee (SRC), August 2006 to April 2011. The five-member committee investigated causes of bird and bat collisions in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, and recommended mitigation and monitoring measures. The SRC reviewed the science underlying the Alameda County Avian Protection Program, and advised

the County on how to reduce wildlife fatalities.

Consulting Ecologist, 2004-2007, California Energy Commission (CEC). Provided consulting services as needed to the CEC on renewable energy impacts, monitoring and research, and produced several reports. Also collaborated with Lawrence-Livermore National Lab on research to understand and reduce wind turbine impacts on wildlife.

Consulting Ecologist, 1999-2013, U.S. Navy. Performed endangered species surveys, hazardous waste site monitoring, and habitat restoration for the endangered San Joaquin kangaroo rat, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, California clapper rail, western burrowing owl, salt marsh harvest mouse, and other species at Naval Air Station Lemoore; Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord; Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island; National Radio Transmitter Facility, Dixon; and, Naval Outlying Landing Field Imperial Beach.

Part-time Lecturer, 1998-2005, California State University, Sacramento. Instructed Mammalogy, Behavioral Ecology, and Ornithology Lab, Contemporary Environmental Issues, Natural Resources Conservation.

Senior Ecologist, 1999-2005, BioResource Consultants. Designed and implemented research and monitoring studies related to avian fatalities at wind turbines, avian electrocutions on electric distribution poles across California, and avian fatalities at transmission lines.

Chairman, Conservation Affairs Committee, The Wildlife Society--Western Section, 1999-2001. Prepared position statements and led efforts directed toward conservation issues, including travel to Washington, D.C. to lobby Congress for more wildlife conservation funding.

Systems Ecologist, 1995-2000, Institute for Sustainable Development. Headed ISD's program on integrated resources management. Developed indicators of ecological integrity for large areas, using remotely sensed data, local community involvement and GIS.

Associate, 1997-1998, Department of Agronomy and Range Science, University of California, Davis. Worked with Shu Geng and Mingua Zhang on several studies related to wildlife interactions with agriculture and patterns of fertilizer and pesticide residues in groundwater across a large landscape.

Lead Scientist, 1996-1999, National Endangered Species Network. Informed academic scientists and environmental activists about emerging issues regarding the Endangered Species Act and other environmental laws. Testified at public hearings on endangered species issues.

Ecologist, 1997-1998, Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology. Conducted field research to determine the impact of past mercury mining on the status of California red-legged frogs in Santa Clara County, California.

Senior Systems Ecologist, 1994-1995, EIP Associates, Sacramento, California. Provided consulting services in environmental planning, and quantitative assessment of land units for their conservation and restoration opportunities basedon ecological resource requirements of 29 special-status species. Developed ecological indicators for prioritizing areas within Yolo County

to receive mitigation funds for habitat easements and restoration.

Post-Graduate Researcher, 1990-1994, Department of Agronomy and Range Science, *U.C. Davis*. Under Dr. Shu Geng's mentorship, studied landscape and management effects on temporal and spatial patterns of abundance among pocket gophers and species of Falconiformes and Carnivora in the Sacramento Valley. Managed and analyzed a data base of energy use in California agriculture. Assisted with landscape (GIS) study of groundwater contamination across Tulare County, California.

Work experience in graduate school: Co-taught Conservation Biology with Dr. Christine Schonewald, 1991 & 1993, UC Davis Graduate Group in Ecology; Reader for Dr. Richard Coss's course on Psychobiology in 1990, UC Davis Department of Psychology; Research Assistant to Dr. Walter E. Howard, 1988-1990, UC Davis Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, testing durable baits for pocket gopher management in forest clearcuts; Research Assistant to Dr. Terrell P. Salmon, 1987-1988, UC Wildlife Extension, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, developing empirical models of mammal and bird invasions in North America, and a rating system for priority research and control of exotic species based on economic, environmental and human health hazards in California. Student Assistant to Dr. E. Lee Fitzhugh, 1985-1987, UC Cooperative Extension, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, developing and implementing statewide mountain lion track count for long-term monitoring.

Fulbright Research Fellow, Indonesia, 1988. Tested use of new sampling methods for numerical monitoring of Sumatran tiger and six other species of endemic felids, and evaluated methods used by other researchers.

**Projects**

Repowering wind energy projects through careful siting of new wind turbines using map-based collision hazard models to minimize impacts to volant wildlife. Funded by wind companies (principally NextEra Renewable Energy, Inc.), California Energy Commission and East Bay Regional Park District, I have collaborated with a GIS analyst and managed a crew of five field biologists performing golden eagle behavior surveys and nocturnal surveys on bats and owls. The goal is to quantify flight patterns for development of predictive models to more carefully site new wind turbines in repowering projects. Focused behavior surveys began May 2012 and continue. Collision hazard models have been prepared for seven wind projects, three of which were built. Planning for additional repowering projects is underway.

Test avian safety of new mixer-ejector wind turbine (MEWT). Designed and implemented a before-after, control-impact experimental design to test the avian safety of a new, shrouded wind turbine developed by Ogin Inc. (formerly known as FloDesign Wind Turbine Corporation). Supported by a $718,000 grant from the California Energy Commission's Public Interest Energy Research program and a 20% match share contribution from Ogin, I managed a crew of seven field biologists who performed periodic fatality searches and behavior surveys, carcass detection trials, nocturnal behavior surveys using a thermal camera, and spatial analyses with the collaboration of a GIS analyst. Field work began 1 April 2012 and ended 30 March 2015 without Ogin installing its MEWTs, but we still achieved multiple important scientific advances.

Reduce avian mortality due to wind turbines at Altamont Pass. Studied wildlife impacts caused by 5,400 wind turbines at the world's most notorious wind resource area. Studied how impacts are perceived by monitoring and how they are affected by terrain, wind patterns, food resources, range management practices, wind turbine operations, seasonal patterns, population cycles, infrastructure management such as electric distribution, animal behavior and social interactions.

Reduce avian mortality on electric distribution poles. Directed research toward reducing bird electrocutions on electric distribution poles, 2000-2007. Oversaw 5 founds of fatality searches at 10,000 poles from Orange County to Glenn County, California, and produced two large reports.

Cook *et al*. v. Rockwell International *et al*., No. 90-K-181 (D. Colorado). Provided expert testimony on the role of burrowing animals in affecting the fate of buried and surface-deposited radioactive and hazardous chemical wastes at the Rocky Flats Plant, Colorado. Provided expert reports based on four site visits and an extensive document review of burrowing animals. Conducted transect surveys for evidence of burrowing animals and other wildlife on and around waste facilities. Discovered substantial intrusion of waste structures by burrowing animals. I testified in federal court in November 2005, and my clients were subsequently awarded a $553,000,000 judgment by a jury. After appeals the award was increased to two billion dollars.

Hanford Nuclear Reservation Litigation. Provided expert testimony on the role of burrowing animals in affecting the fate of buried radioactive wastes at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, Washington. Provided three expert reports based on three site visits and extensive document review. Predicted and verified a certain population density of pocket gophers on buried waste structures, as well as incidence of radionuclide contamination in body tissue. Conducted transect surveys for evidence of burrowing animals and other wildlife on and around waste facilities. Discovered substantial intrusion of waste structures by burrowing animals.

Expert testimony and declarations on proposed residential and commercial developments, gas-fired power plants, wind, solar and geothermal projects, water transfers and water transfer delivery systems, endangered species recovery plans, Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Communities Conservation Programs. Testified before multiple government agencies, Tribunals, Boards of Supervisors and City Councils, and participated with press conferences and depositions. Prepared expert witness reports and court declarations, which are summarized under Reports (below).

Protocol-level surveys for special-status species. Used California Department of Fish and Wildlife and US Fish and Wildlife Service protocols to search for California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, arroyo southwestern toad, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, western pond turtle, giant kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kit fox, western burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle and other special-status species.

Conservation of San Joaquin kangaroo rat. Performed research to identify factors responsible for the decline of this endangered species at Lemoore Naval Air Station, 2000-2013, and implemented habitat enhancements designed to reverse the trend and expand the population.

Impact of West Nile Virus on yellow-billed magpies. Funded by Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District, 2005-2008, compared survey results pre- and post-West Nile Virus epidemic for multiple bird species in the Sacramento Valley, particularly on yellow-billed magpie and American crow due to susceptibility to WNV.

Workshops on HCPs. Assisted Dr. Michael Morrison with organizing and conducting a 2-day workshop on Habitat Conservation Plans, sponsored by Southern California Edison, and another 1-day workshop sponsored by PG&E. These Workshops were attended by academics, attorneys, and consultants with HCP experience. We guest-edited a Proceedings published in Environmental Management.

Mapping of biological resources along Highways 101, 46 and 41. Used GPS and GIS to delineate vegetation complexes and locations of special-status species along 26 miles of highway in San Luis Obispo County, 14 miles of highway and roadway in Monterey County, and in a large area north of Fresno, including within reclaimed gravel mining pits.

GPS mapping and monitoring at restoration sites and at Caltrans mitigation sites. Monitored the success of elderberry shrubs at one location, the success of willows at another location, and the response of wildlife to the succession of vegetation at both sites. Also used GPS to monitor the response of fossorial animals to yellow star-thistle eradication and natural grassland restoration efforts at Bear Valley in Colusa County and at the decommissioned Mather Air Force Base in Sacramento County.

Mercury effects on Red-legged Frog. Assisted Dr. Michael Morrison and US Fish and Wildlife Service in assessing the possible impacts of historical mercury mining on the federally listed California red-legged frog in Santa Clara County. Also measured habitat variables in streams.

Opposition to proposed No Surprises rule. Wrote a white paper and summary letter explaining scientific grounds for opposing the incidental take permit (ITP) rules providing ITP applicants and holders with general assurances they will be free of compliance with the Endangered Species Act once they adhere to the terms of a "properly functioning HCP." Submitted 188 signatures of scientists and environmental professionals concerned about No Surprises rule US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, all US Senators.

Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan alternative. Designed narrow channel marsh to increase the likelihood of survival and recovery in the wild of giant garter snake, Swainson's hawk and Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The design included replication and interspersion of treatments for experimental testing of critical habitat elements. I provided a report to Northern Territories, Inc.

Assessments of agricultural production system and environmental technology transfer to China. Twice visited China and interviewed scientists, industrialists, agriculturalists, and the Directors of the Chinese Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture to assess the need and possible pathways for environmental clean-up technologies and trade opportunities between the US and China.

Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan. Conducted landscape ecology study of Yolo County to spatially prioritize allocation of mitigation efforts to improve ecosystem functionality within the County from the perspective of 29 special-status species of wildlife and plants. Used a hierarchically structured indicators approach to apply principles of landscape and ecosystem ecology, conservation biology, and local values in rating land units. Derived GIS maps to help guide the conservation area design, and then developed implementation strategies.

Mountain lion track count. Developed and conducted a carnivore monitoring program throughout California since 1985. Species counted include mountain lion, bobcat, black bear, coyote, red and gray fox, raccoon, striped skunk, badger, and black-tailed deer. Vegetation and land use are also monitored. Track survey transect was established on dusty, dirt roads within randomly selected quadrats.

Sumatran tiger and other felids. Upon award of Fulbright Research Fellowship, I designed and initiated track counts for seven species of wild cats in Sumatra, including Sumatran tiger, fishing cat, and golden cat. Spent four months on Sumatra and Java in 1988, and learned Bahasa Indonesia, the official Indonesian language.

Wildlife in agriculture. Beginning as post-graduate research, I studied pocket gophers and other wildlife in 40 alfalfa fields throughout the Sacramento Valley, and I surveyed for wildlife along a 200 mile road transect since 1989 with a hiatus of 1996-2004. The data are analyzed using GIS and methods from landscape ecology, and the results published and presented orally to farming groups in California and elsewhere. I also conducted the first study of wildlife in cover crops used on vineyards and orchards.

Agricultural energy use and Tulare County groundwater study. Developed and analyzed a data base of energy use in California agriculture, and collaborated on a landscape (GIS) study of groundwater contamination across Tulare County, California.

Pocket gopher damage in forest clear-cuts. Developed gopher sampling methods and tested various poison baits and baiting regimes in the largest-ever field study of pocket gopher management in forest plantations, involving 68 research plots in 55 clear-cuts among 6 National Forests in northern California.

Risk assessment of exotic species in North America. Developed empirical models of mammal and bird species invasions in North America, as well as a rating system for assigning priority research and control to exotic species in California, based on economic, environmental, and human health hazards.

**Peer Reviewed Publications**

Smallwood, K. S. 2022. Utility-scale solar impacts to volant wildlife. Journal of Wildlife Management: e22216. https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.22216

Smallwood, K. S., and N. L. Smallwood. 2021. Breeding Density and Collision Mortality of Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. Diversity 13, 540. https://doi.org/10.3390/d13110540.

Smallwood, K. S. 2020. USA wind energy-caused bat fatalities increase with shorter fatality search intervals. Diversity 12(98); https://doi.org/10.3390/d12030098

Smallwood, K. S., D. A. Bell, and S. Standish. 2020. Dogs detect larger wind energy impacts on bats and birds. Journal of Wildlife Management 84:852-864. DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.21863.

Smallwood, K. S., and D. A. Bell. 2020. Relating bat passage rates to wind turbine fatalities.

Diversity 12(84); doi:10.3390/d12020084.

Smallwood, K. S., and D. A. Bell. 2020. Effects of wind turbine curtailment on bird and bat fatalities. Journal of Wildlife Management 84:684-696. DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.21844

Kitano, M., M. Ino, K. S. Smallwood, and S. Shiraki. 2020. Seasonal difference in carcass persistence rates at wind farms with snow, Hokkaido, Japan. Ornithological Science 19: 63 – 71.

Smallwood, K. S. and M. L. Morrison. 2018. Nest-site selection in a high-density colony of burrowing owls. Journal of Raptor Research 52:454-470.

Smallwood, K. S., D. A. Bell, E. L. Walther, E. Leyvas, S. Standish, J. Mount, B. Karas. 2018. Estimating wind turbine fatalities using integrated detection trials. Journal of Wildlife Management 82:1169-1184.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. Long search intervals under-estimate bird and bat fatalities caused by wind turbines. Wildlife Society Bulletin 41:224-230.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. The challenges of addressing wildlife impacts when repowering wind energy projects. Pages 175-187 in Köppel, J., Editor, Wind Energy and Wildlife Impacts: Proceedings from the CWW2015 Conference. Springer. Cham, Switzerland.

May, R., Gill, A. B., Köppel, J. Langston, R. H.W., Reichenbach, M., Scheidat, M., Smallwood, S., Voigt, C. C., Hüppop, O., and Portman, M. 2017. Future research directions to reconcile wind turbine–wildlife interactions. Pages 255-276 in Köppel, J., Editor, Wind Energy and Wildlife Impacts: Proceedings from the CWW2015 Conference. Springer. Cham, Switzerland.

Smallwood, K. S. 2017. Monitoring birds. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Smallwood, K. S., L. Neher, and D. A. Bell. 2017. Turbine siting for raptors: an example from Repowering of the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. M. Perrow, Ed., Wildlife and Wind Farms - Conflicts and Solutions, Volume 2. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, United Kingdom. www.bit.ly/2v3cR9Q

Johnson, D. H., S. R. Loss, K. S. Smallwood, W. P. Erickson. 2016. Avian fatalities at wind energy facilities in North America: A comparison of recent approaches. Human–Wildlife Interactions 10(1):7-18.

Sadar, M. J., D. S.-M. Guzman, A. Mete, J. Foley, N. Stephenson, K. H. Rogers, C. Grosset, K. S. Smallwood, J. Shipman, A. Wells, S. D. White, D. A. Bell, and M. G. Hawkins. 2015. Mange Caused by a novel Micnemidocoptes mite in a Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*). Journal of Avian Medicine and Surgery 29(3):231-237.

Smallwood, K. S. 2015. Habitat fragmentation and corridors. Pages 84-101 in M. L. Morrison and H. A. Mathewson, Eds., Wildlife habitat conservation: concepts, challenges, and solutions. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.

# EXHIBIT D

FASTCAST

Deborah Holley

Cc/ Richard Drurey

December 1, 2025

# PRELIMINARY SHADOW ANALYSIS: **PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING 2025**, JOE DIMAGGIO PLAYGROUND, SAN FRANCISCO

Fastcast is hereby submitting the results of a **programmatic shadow analysis** prepared for the proposed **Family Zoning Plan**. This analysis is intended to quantify the **generalized potential change in shadow on Joe DiMaggio Playground** under a scenario in which the proposed height increases on surrounding parcels are fully utilized.

As part of the methodology, **City building footprint data** was used to define both the **existing zoning height extrusions** and the **Family Zoning Plan height extrusions** using the **same building footprints**. In this area, the **existing zoning envelope (generally 40 feet in height)** is treated as an **existing shadow-casting condition**, and the Family Zoning scenario adds only the **incremental height above this existing zoning envelope**. The **proposed shadows are therefore based solely on the height increase introduced by the Family Zoning Plan**, and **net new shadow** on Joe DiMaggio Playground is calculated only for this **incremental zoning height increase**.

The analysis applies **methodologies and data models consistent with San Francisco Planning Department and Planning Code Section 295 ("Shadow Ordinance") standards and procedures**, as outlined in the July 2014 memorandum *"Shadow Analysis Procedures and Scope Requirements"* and as refined by subsequent written directives issued by the San Francisco Planning Department.

# I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum documents **preliminary quantitative shadow results** for **Joe DiMaggio Playground** associated with proposed height increases under the **San Francisco Family Zoning Plan (FZP)** in the North Beach area.

The purpose is to:

1. Summarize the **Family Zoning Plan objectives**,
2. Describe the **objective of the shadow analysis** for Joe DiMaggio Playground, and
3. Present a **neutral, scientific summary** of the **net new shadow** on the playground and the **times of day/season** when this potential shadow increase overlaps with typical playground activities.

No conclusions are offered regarding policy, compliance, or adequacy; this memo is limited to **description and quantification**.

# II. FAMILY ZONING PLAN – CONTEXT & OBJECTIVES

According to the **Family Zoning Plan "Five Fast Facts"** document:

- The Plan is intended to create capacity for **over 36,000 homes** on San Francisco's north and west sides.
- In most areas, existing building heights remain **40 feet (approximately four stories)**.
- The Plan allows **two to four additional stories** in select locations, mainly **near shopping, transit, and on major streets**, with high-rise buildings permitted only in limited areas.
- The Plan uses a **form-based approach**, regulating height, bulk, and setbacks, and is paired with **objective design standards**.
- The stated goals include meeting state housing requirements, maintaining local control over land use decisions, and strengthening tenant protections by directing growth toward underused and vacant sites.

Within this framework, the North Beach area surrounding **Joe DiMaggio Playground** is identified for **increased maximum building heights**, which in turn has the potential to increase shadow on the playground.

# III. OBJECTIVE OF THE SHADOW ANALYSIS

The objective of the shadow analysis is to **quantify net new shadow** that could occur on **Joe DiMaggio Playground** as a result of the **proposed Family Zoning height increases**, using standard methods applied in San Francisco shadow studies.

Specifically, the analysis aims to:

1. Measure **annual shadow load** on Joe DiMaggio Playground under:
    - Existing conditions, and
    - A scenario with Family Zoning Plan height increases.
2. Determine:
    - **Net new annual shadow** (in square foot hours, sfh),
    - **Percent of available sunlight time** affected,
    - **Maximum area of net new shadow** and **percentage of the playground covered**, and
    - **Dates, times of day, and seasons** when net new shadow occurs.

These results are summarized in the City's **"PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING HEIGHT INCREASE – JOE DIMAGGIO ANNUAL SHADOW LOADS / SQUARE FOOT HOURS (sfh)"** sheet, which is the primary quantitative source referenced here.

FASTCAST

# IV. QUANTITATIVE SHADOW RESULTS – JOE DIMAGGIO PLAYGROUND

All values below are taken directly from the **Joe DiMaggio Playground shadow summary** unless otherwise noted. Note: Existing shadow is based on Data SF Building Footprints : https://data.sfgov.org/Geographic-Locations-and-Boundaries/Building-Footprints/ynuv-fyni/about_data and Zoning heights derived from Proposed zoning interactive map: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6e0e399f9c82456dbda233eacebc433d/

| PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING HEIGHT INCREASE<br>JOE DIMAGGIO ANNUAL SHADOW LOADS / SQUARE FOOT HOURS (sfh) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Existing / Current Shadow | Project Net New Shadow | Existing + Project Shadow | Remaining Sunlight |
| **9.63%** | **1.485%** | **11.115%** | **88.89%** |
| 31,210,748 sfh | 4,814,888 sfh | 36,025,636 sfh | 288,182,732 sfh |

| | |
|---|---|
| Joe DiMaggio Annual Shadow Load with Project (sfh) | 36,025,636 sfh |

| EXISTING SHADOW DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| Range in existing shadow area coverage throughout the year | Between 2% - 72% |
| Time of year / time of day most affected by existing shadow | Fall / Early Morning (before 8:00 AM) |

| NET NEW SHADOW DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| Days net new shadow would occur (date range) | Year-round |
| Date(s) with most sfh net new shadow | October 11 & March 1 |
| Season / Time of day most affected by net new shadow | Winter / Late Afternoon (after 4:30 PM) |
| Area of largest net new shadow (date and time) | 23,682 sf (October 11 & March 1 @ 5:37 PM ) |
| Percentage of Joe DiMaggio covered by largest shadow | 27.18% |
| Range in shadow coverage throughout the year (area range) | Between 0% - 27% (0 - 23,682 sf ) |
| Average shadow size across affected dates (percent coverage) | 4,488 sf (5.15%) |
| Date(s) with the longest duration of net new shadow (duration) | October 11 & March 1 (4 hr 6 min +/- 14 min) |
| Range in daily net new shadow duration across affected dates | Between zero minutes up to 4 hr 6 min (+/- 14 min) |
| Average daily net new shadow duration across affected dates | 3 hr 22 min |

## Timing and Seasonal Pattern of Net New Shadow

Also from the shadow summary:

- **Days net new shadow would occur:**
  - **Year-round**
- **Date(s) with most sfh net new shadow:**
  - **October 11 & March 1**
  - **Season / Time of day most affected by net new shadow: Winter / Late Afternoon (after 4:30 PM)**

## Existing Shadow Context

For reference, the summary characterizes **existing shadow** as:

- **Range in existing shadow area coverage throughout the year: 2% – 72%** of the playground area
- **Time of year / time of day most affected by existing shadow: Fall / Early Morning (before 8:00 AM)**




# V. QUALITATIVE CONTEXT: PLAYGROUND ACTIVITIES & TIME OF USE

This section does **not** evaluate impact or significance. It is limited to describing **typical types of activities** that commonly occur in neighborhood playgrounds like Joe DiMaggio during the times identified in the shadow summary.

## A. Typical Playground Use Patterns

Based on the nature of Joe DiMaggio Playground as a neighborhood-serving facility (with play equipment, courts/fields, and open space), typical use patterns can reasonably be described as including:

- **Morning hours:**
  - Caregivers with young children,
  - Individual exercise and walking.
- **Midday / Early afternoon:**
  - Younger children and caregivers,
  - Some daytime recreation by residents and visitors.
- **Afternoon / Late afternoon (after school):**
  - **School-aged children and teens** using play areas and courts,
  - Potential **organized or informal sports activities**,
  - Families visiting after school pick-up.
- **Early evening (seasonally):**
  - Adults and families using the space after work,
  - Light recreation, socializing, and play until dusk.

These patterns are typical of urban playgrounds serving nearby residential neighborhoods with families.

## B. Alignment with Net New Shadow Timing

The **shadow summary** identifies the **season and time of day most affected by net new shadow** as **"Winter / Late Afternoon (after 4:30 PM)"**, with net new shadow occurring **year-round** and the **longest durations and largest footprints** occurring around **October 11 and March 1 in the late afternoon (e.g., 5:37 PM for the largest single footprint).**
That time window generally overlaps with:

- **After-school hours** for school-aged children and teens, and
- **After-work hours** when adults and families may visit the playground.

The **existing shadow** is described as being most pronounced in **"Fall / Early Morning (before 8:00 AM)"**, which is a different part of the day than the late-afternoon period identified for net new shadow. This indicates that, under the Family Zoning scenario, the **distribution of shadow over the day** changes, with **additional shadow present during late-afternoon hours** when playground use often involves family and youth activities.
Again, this section is descriptive only and does not characterize these changes as beneficial or adverse.

# VI. SUMMARY

- The Family Zoning Plan allows **increased building heights** in select areas, including near Joe DiMaggio Playground, in order to support housing production goals and apply form-based, objective design standards.
- The City's **Joe DiMaggio shadow summary** quantifies **net new annual shadow load, coverage, and timing** for the playground under the Family Zoning height scenario, showing:
    - Net new shadow of **4,814,888 sfh (1.485% of available sunlight time)**,
    - A combined total shadow load of **36,025,636 sfh (11.115%)**,
    - Maximum net new momentary coverage of **23,682 square feet (27.18% of the playground)** on specific dates and times, and
    - Concentration of net new shadow in **winter late afternoons (after 4:30 PM)**, with **year-round occurrence**.
- Typical playground use during late afternoons includes **after-school and after-work** activities by children, teens, and families, which may coincide in time with the **period identified as most affected by net new shadow**.

This concludes the **descriptive, non-evaluative summary** of the Family Zoning Plan context and the associated shadow analysis results for Joe DiMaggio Playground.

## Conclusion

Fastcast has determined, based on the 3D digital zoning-based massing model and related design information provided by DataSF and the proposed Family Zoning Plan that the height increase would introduce net new shadow on Joe DiMaggio Playground relative to existing zoning conditions. The results presented herein reflect a programmatic, zoning-based analysis; as individual development proposals are advanced and more detailed building designs become available, additional project-specific shadow studies can be prepared using the same methodologies to further refine these findings.

Please direct any question to Adam Noble. adam@fastcastcity.com



# EXHIBIT A

PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

FASTCAST

# JUNE 21

Summer solstice
Analysis hours: 6:46 AM-7:36 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:46 AM | 54,298 sf | 62.33% | 2,884 sf | 3.31% |
| 7:00 AM | 37,059 sf | 42.54% | 4,008 sf | 4.60% |
| 7:15 AM | 27,564 sf | 31.64% | 3,779 sf | 4.34% |
| 7:30 AM | 21,585 sf | 24.78% | 3,408 sf | 3.91% |
| 7:45 AM | 16,695 sf | 19.16% | 3,117 sf | 3.58% |
| 8:00 AM | 12,478 sf | 14.32% | 2,829 sf | 3.25% |
| 8:15 AM | 8,935 sf | 10.26% | 2,548 sf | 2.92% |
| 8:30 AM | 5,965 sf | 6.85% | 2,316 sf | 2.66% |
| 8:45 AM | 4,408 sf | 5.06% | 1,881 sf | 2.16% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,173 sf | 4.79% | 730 sf | 0.84% |
| 9:15 AM | 3,995 sf | 4.59% | 6 sf | 0.01% |
| 9:30 AM | 3,816 sf | 4.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,655 sf | 4.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,476 sf | 3.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,299 sf | 3.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,114 sf | 3.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 2,951 sf | 3.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,772 sf | 3.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,615 sf | 3.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,434 sf | 2.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,277 sf | 2.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,094 sf | 2.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 1,940 sf | 2.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,737 sf | 1.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,578 sf | 1.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,344 sf | 1.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,442 sf | 1.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,521 sf | 1.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,658 sf | 1.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,721 sf | 1.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,841 sf | 2.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 1,898 sf | 2.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 1,995 sf | 2.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,049 sf | 2.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,132 sf | 2.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,186 sf | 2.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,248 sf | 2.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,241 sf | 2.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,472 sf | 2.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,013 sf | 3.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,530 sf | 4.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,110 sf | 4.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,753 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,486 sf | 6.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,314 sf | 7.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,287 sf | 8.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,437 sf | 9.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,878 sf | 11.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,730 sf | 13.46% | 295 sf | 0.34% |
| 7:00 PM | 14,222 sf | 16.33% | 1,770 sf | 2.03% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,809 sf | 20.44% | 5,586 sf | 6.41% |
| 7:36 PM | 29,084 sf | 33.38% | 10,652 sf | 12.23% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JUNE 28

Mirror date: June 14
Analysis hours: 6:48 AM-7:36 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:48 AM | 54,172 sf | 62.18% | 2,814 sf | 3.23% |
| 7:00 AM | 38,856 sf | 44.60% | 4,046 sf | 4.64% |
| 7:15 AM | 28,513 sf | 32.73% | 3,845 sf | 4.41% |
| 7:30 AM | 22,279 sf | 25.57% | 3,463 sf | 3.97% |
| 7:45 AM | 17,311 sf | 19.87% | 3,154 sf | 3.62% |
| 8:00 AM | 12,968 sf | 14.88% | 2,875 sf | 3.30% |
| 8:15 AM | 9,336 sf | 10.72% | 2,593 sf | 2.98% |
| 8:30 AM | 6,273 sf | 7.20% | 2,353 sf | 2.70% |
| 8:45 AM | 4,507 sf | 5.17% | 2,014 sf | 2.31% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,222 sf | 4.85% | 875 sf | 1.00% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,036 sf | 4.63% | 30 sf | 0.03% |
| 9:30 AM | 3,857 sf | 4.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,694 sf | 4.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,516 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,340 sf | 3.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,152 sf | 3.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 2,989 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,807 sf | 3.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,650 sf | 3.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,469 sf | 2.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,308 sf | 2.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,127 sf | 2.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 1,973 sf | 2.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,769 sf | 2.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,612 sf | 1.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,364 sf | 1.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,451 sf | 1.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,523 sf | 1.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,661 sf | 1.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,728 sf | 1.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,848 sf | 2.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 1,902 sf | 2.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,006 sf | 2.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,063 sf | 2.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,146 sf | 2.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,197 sf | 2.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,264 sf | 2.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,230 sf | 2.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,455 sf | 2.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,953 sf | 3.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,470 sf | 3.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,046 sf | 4.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,679 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,407 sf | 6.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,230 sf | 7.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,192 sf | 8.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,321 sf | 9.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,741 sf | 11.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,553 sf | 13.26% | 223 sf | 0.26% |
| 7:00 PM | 13,976 sf | 16.04% | 1,556 sf | 1.79% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,471 sf | 20.05% | 5,228 sf | 6.00% |
| 7:36 PM | 28,841 sf | 33.10% | 10,732 sf | 12.32% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 5

Mirror date: June 7
Analysis hours: 6:52 AM-7:36 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:52 AM | 53,801 sf | 61.75% | 2,547 sf | 2.92% |
| 7:00 AM | 41,891 sf | 48.08% | 4,088 sf | 4.69% |
| 7:15 AM | 29,973 sf | 34.40% | 3,979 sf | 4.57% |
| 7:30 AM | 23,337 sf | 26.79% | 3,577 sf | 4.11% |
| 7:45 AM | 18,182 sf | 20.87% | 3,252 sf | 3.73% |
| 8:00 AM | 13,674 sf | 15.70% | 2,949 sf | 3.39% |
| 8:15 AM | 9,879 sf | 11.34% | 2,662 sf | 3.06% |
| 8:30 AM | 6,755 sf | 7.75% | 2,412 sf | 2.77% |
| 8:45 AM | 4,826 sf | 5.54% | 2,115 sf | 2.43% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,330 sf | 4.97% | 1,079 sf | 1.24% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,139 sf | 4.75% | 107 sf | 0.12% |
| 9:30 AM | 3,954 sf | 4.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,782 sf | 4.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,600 sf | 4.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,421 sf | 3.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,230 sf | 3.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,063 sf | 3.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,880 sf | 3.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,722 sf | 3.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,539 sf | 2.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,377 sf | 2.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,192 sf | 2.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,041 sf | 2.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,835 sf | 2.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,675 sf | 1.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,424 sf | 1.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,483 sf | 1.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,568 sf | 1.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,705 sf | 1.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,776 sf | 2.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,894 sf | 2.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 1,956 sf | 2.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,062 sf | 2.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,117 sf | 2.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,204 sf | 2.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,256 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,337 sf | 2.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,358 sf | 2.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,466 sf | 2.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,885 sf | 3.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,408 sf | 3.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,984 sf | 4.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,615 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,340 sf | 6.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,165 sf | 7.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,127 sf | 8.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,255 sf | 9.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,671 sf | 11.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,478 sf | 13.17% | 170 sf | 0.20% |
| 7:00 PM | 13,898 sf | 15.95% | 1,396 sf | 1.60% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,367 sf | 19.94% | 4,992 sf | 5.73% |
| 7:36 PM | 28,122 sf | 32.28% | 10,951 sf | 12.57% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 12

Mirror date: May 31
Analysis hours: 6:56 AM-7:33 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 6:56 AM | 53,097 sf | 60.95% | 2,408 sf | 2.76% |
| 7:00 AM | 47,045 sf | 54.00% | 3,395 sf | 3.90% |
| 7:15 AM | 32,076 sf | 36.82% | 4,194 sf | 4.81% |
| 7:30 AM | 24,775 sf | 28.44% | 3,764 sf | 4.32% |
| 7:45 AM | 19,251 sf | 22.10% | 3,412 sf | 3.92% |
| 8:00 AM | 14,578 sf | 16.73% | 3,072 sf | 3.53% |
| 8:15 AM | 10,583 sf | 12.15% | 2,769 sf | 3.18% |
| 8:30 AM | 7,405 sf | 8.50% | 2,490 sf | 2.86% |
| 8:45 AM | 5,297 sf | 6.08% | 2,234 sf | 2.56% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,503 sf | 5.17% | 1,333 sf | 1.53% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,299 sf | 4.93% | 244 sf | 0.28% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,099 sf | 4.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 3,921 sf | 4.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,732 sf | 4.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,545 sf | 4.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,347 sf | 3.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,178 sf | 3.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 2,989 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,825 sf | 3.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,640 sf | 3.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,482 sf | 2.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,290 sf | 2.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,134 sf | 2.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 1,930 sf | 2.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,769 sf | 2.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,511 sf | 1.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,552 sf | 1.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,648 sf | 1.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,788 sf | 2.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,857 sf | 2.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 1,980 sf | 2.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,043 sf | 2.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,144 sf | 2.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,204 sf | 2.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,300 sf | 2.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,352 sf | 2.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,434 sf | 2.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,473 sf | 2.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,494 sf | 2.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,739 sf | 3.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,340 sf | 3.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,920 sf | 4.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,559 sf | 5.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,289 sf | 6.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,121 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,093 sf | 8.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,235 sf | 9.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,661 sf | 11.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,496 sf | 13.20% | 125 sf | 0.14% |
| 7:00 PM | 13,972 sf | 16.04% | 1,296 sf | 1.49% |
| 7:15 PM | 17,555 sf | 20.15% | 5,128 sf | 5.89% |
| 7:33 PM | 26,959 sf | 30.95% | 11,312 sf | 12.98% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 19

Mirror date: May 24
Analysis hours: 7:01 AM-7:30 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:01 AM | 52,271 sf | 60.00% | 2,281 sf | 2.62% |
| 7:16 AM | 33,985 sf | 39.01% | 4,487 sf | 5.15% |
| 7:30 AM | 26,609 sf | 30.54% | 4,026 sf | 4.62% |
| 7:45 AM | 20,576 sf | 23.62% | 3,616 sf | 4.15% |
| 8:00 AM | 15,675 sf | 17.99% | 3,246 sf | 3.73% |
| 8:15 AM | 11,348 sf | 13.03% | 2,894 sf | 3.32% |
| 8:30 AM | 8,334 sf | 9.57% | 2,614 sf | 3.00% |
| 8:45 AM | 5,925 sf | 6.80% | 2,348 sf | 2.69% |
| 9:00 AM | 4,748 sf | 5.45% | 1,645 sf | 1.89% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,521 sf | 5.19% | 435 sf | 0.50% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,297 sf | 4.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,101 sf | 4.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 3,908 sf | 4.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,712 sf | 4.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,506 sf | 4.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,328 sf | 3.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,134 sf | 3.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 2,966 sf | 3.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,777 sf | 3.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,612 sf | 3.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,418 sf | 2.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,259 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,055 sf | 2.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 1,889 sf | 2.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,634 sf | 1.88% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,667 sf | 1.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,764 sf | 2.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 1,906 sf | 2.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 1,976 sf | 2.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,103 sf | 2.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,169 sf | 2.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,279 sf | 2.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,341 sf | 2.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,433 sf | 2.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,495 sf | 2.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,579 sf | 2.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,632 sf | 3.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,708 sf | 3.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,796 sf | 3.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,271 sf | 3.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,867 sf | 4.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,521 sf | 5.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,258 sf | 6.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,110 sf | 7.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,108 sf | 8.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,283 sf | 9.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,748 sf | 11.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,658 sf | 13.38% | 95 sf | 0.11% |
| 7:00 PM | 14,252 sf | 16.36% | 1,311 sf | 1.50% |
| 7:15 PM | 18,041 sf | 20.71% | 5,948 sf | 6.83% |
| 7:30 PM | 25,516 sf | 29.29% | 11,670 sf | 13.39% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# JULY 26

Mirror date: May 17
Analysis hours: 7:07 AM-7:25 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:07 AM | 51,090 sf | 58.64% | 2,572 sf | 2.95% |
| 7:15 AM | 38,869 sf | 44.62% | 4,946 sf | 5.68% |
| 7:30 AM | 29,015 sf | 33.30% | 4,396 sf | 5.05% |
| 7:45 AM | 22,226 sf | 25.51% | 3,892 sf | 4.47% |
| 8:00 AM | 17,041 sf | 19.56% | 3,464 sf | 3.98% |
| 8:15 AM | 12,600 sf | 14.46% | 3,080 sf | 3.54% |
| 8:30 AM | 9,453 sf | 10.85% | 2,749 sf | 3.16% |
| 8:45 AM | 6,765 sf | 7.77% | 2,461 sf | 2.82% |
| 9:00 AM | 5,085 sf | 5.84% | 1,979 sf | 2.27% |
| 9:15 AM | 4,794 sf | 5.50% | 709 sf | 0.81% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,553 sf | 5.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,336 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 4,121 sf | 4.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 3,918 sf | 4.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,704 sf | 4.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,517 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,313 sf | 3.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,139 sf | 3.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 2,940 sf | 3.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,774 sf | 3.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,575 sf | 2.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,411 sf | 2.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,204 sf | 2.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,039 sf | 2.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,783 sf | 2.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 1,826 sf | 2.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 1,921 sf | 2.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,063 sf | 2.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,139 sf | 2.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,261 sf | 2.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,336 sf | 2.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,452 sf | 2.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,518 sf | 2.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,619 sf | 3.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,681 sf | 3.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 2,775 sf | 3.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 2,839 sf | 3.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 2,913 sf | 3.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 2,900 sf | 3.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,172 sf | 3.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,822 sf | 4.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,489 sf | 5.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,251 sf | 6.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,127 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,164 sf | 8.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,391 sf | 9.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 9,922 sf | 11.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:45 PM | 11,942 sf | 13.71% | 76 sf | 0.09% |
| 7:00 PM | 14,750 sf | 16.93% | 2,024 sf | 2.32% |
| 7:15 PM | 18,880 sf | 21.67% | 7,511 sf | 8.62% |
| 7:25 PM | 23,869 sf | 27.40% | 11,981 sf | 13.75% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 2

Mirror date: May 10
Analysis hours: 7:12 AM-7:18 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:12 AM | 48,899 sf | 56.13% | 3,210 sf | 3.68% |
| 7:15 AM | 44,825 sf | 51.45% | 4,215 sf | 4.84% |
| 7:30 AM | 31,918 sf | 36.64% | 4,868 sf | 5.59% |
| 7:45 AM | 24,175 sf | 27.75% | 4,263 sf | 4.89% |
| 8:00 AM | 18,553 sf | 21.30% | 3,728 sf | 4.28% |
| 8:15 AM | 14,279 sf | 16.39% | 3,295 sf | 3.78% |
| 8:30 AM | 10,743 sf | 12.33% | 2,923 sf | 3.36% |
| 8:45 AM | 7,817 sf | 8.97% | 2,600 sf | 2.98% |
| 9:00 AM | 5,672 sf | 6.51% | 2,244 sf | 2.58% |
| 9:15 AM | 5,131 sf | 5.89% | 1,027 sf | 1.18% |
| 9:30 AM | 4,852 sf | 5.57% | 31 sf | 0.04% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,613 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 4,376 sf | 5.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 4,168 sf | 4.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 3,937 sf | 4.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,739 sf | 4.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,523 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,342 sf | 3.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,133 sf | 3.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 2,962 sf | 3.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,757 sf | 3.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,591 sf | 2.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,382 sf | 2.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,210 sf | 2.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 1,959 sf | 2.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,024 sf | 2.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,120 sf | 2.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,258 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,339 sf | 2.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,465 sf | 2.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,542 sf | 2.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,661 sf | 3.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,738 sf | 3.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 2,844 sf | 3.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 2,912 sf | 3.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 3,018 sf | 3.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 3,086 sf | 3.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 3,193 sf | 3.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,263 sf | 3.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,320 sf | 3.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,739 sf | 4.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,484 sf | 5.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,284 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,195 sf | 7.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,291 sf | 8.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,600 sf | 9.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:30 PM | 10,238 sf | 11.75% | 20 sf | 0.02% |
| 6:45 PM | 12,439 sf | 14.28% | 571 sf | 0.66% |
| 7:00 PM | 15,579 sf | 17.88% | 3,668 sf | 4.21% |
| 7:15 PM | 20,473 sf | 23.50% | 9,975 sf | 11.45% |
| 7:18 PM | 22,329 sf | 25.63% | 11,739 sf | 13.47% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 9

Mirror date: May 3
Analysis hours: 7:19 AM-7:10 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:19 AM | 47,564 sf | 54.60% | 3,935 sf | 4.52% |
| 7:30 AM | 35,705 sf | 40.98% | 5,440 sf | 6.24% |
| 7:45 AM | 26,531 sf | 30.45% | 4,730 sf | 5.43% |
| 8:00 AM | 20,849 sf | 23.93% | 4,088 sf | 4.69% |
| 8:15 AM | 16,239 sf | 18.64% | 3,560 sf | 4.09% |
| 8:30 AM | 12,269 sf | 14.08% | 3,131 sf | 3.59% |
| 8:45 AM | 9,041 sf | 10.38% | 2,768 sf | 3.18% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,489 sf | 7.45% | 2,425 sf | 2.78% |
| 9:15 AM | 5,524 sf | 6.34% | 1,383 sf | 1.59% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,210 sf | 5.98% | 162 sf | 0.19% |
| 9:45 AM | 4,940 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 4,678 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 4,449 sf | 5.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 4,206 sf | 4.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 3,993 sf | 4.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 3,769 sf | 4.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,570 sf | 4.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,356 sf | 3.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,181 sf | 3.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 2,969 sf | 3.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 2,796 sf | 3.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,582 sf | 2.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,405 sf | 2.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,161 sf | 2.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,255 sf | 2.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,348 sf | 2.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,489 sf | 2.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,572 sf | 2.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,707 sf | 3.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 2,790 sf | 3.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 2,916 sf | 3.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 2,993 sf | 3.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 3,113 sf | 3.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 3,195 sf | 3.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 3,308 sf | 3.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 3,388 sf | 3.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 3,499 sf | 4.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,591 sf | 4.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 3,715 sf | 4.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 3,848 sf | 4.42% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,499 sf | 5.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,347 sf | 6.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,322 sf | 7.26% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,490 sf | 8.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:15 PM | 8,906 sf | 10.22% | 38 sf | 0.04% |
| 6:30 PM | 10,707 sf | 12.29% | 646 sf | 0.74% |
| 6:45 PM | 13,191 sf | 15.14% | 1,973 sf | 2.26% |
| 7:10 PM | 20,827 sf | 23.91% | 11,528 sf | 13.23% |

SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 16

Mirror date: April 26
Analysis hours: 7:25 AM-7:02 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:25 AM | 47,761 sf | 54.82% | 4,668 sf | 5.36% |
| 7:30 AM | 41,320 sf | 47.43% | 5,845 sf | 6.71% |
| 7:45 AM | 30,535 sf | 35.05% | 5,324 sf | 6.11% |
| 8:00 AM | 23,646 sf | 27.14% | 4,536 sf | 5.21% |
| 8:15 AM | 18,585 sf | 21.33% | 3,889 sf | 4.46% |
| 8:30 AM | 14,077 sf | 16.16% | 3,376 sf | 3.88% |
| 8:45 AM | 10,458 sf | 12.00% | 2,964 sf | 3.40% |
| 9:00 AM | 7,514 sf | 8.62% | 2,604 sf | 2.99% |
| 9:15 AM | 5,982 sf | 6.87% | 1,796 sf | 2.06% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,623 sf | 6.45% | 383 sf | 0.44% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,318 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,027 sf | 5.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 4,774 sf | 5.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 4,509 sf | 5.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,281 sf | 4.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,052 sf | 4.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 3,842 sf | 4.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,612 sf | 4.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,421 sf | 3.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 3,203 sf | 3.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,026 sf | 3.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 2,811 sf | 3.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,630 sf | 3.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,394 sf | 2.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,524 sf | 2.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,617 sf | 3.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 2,760 sf | 3.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 2,850 sf | 3.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 2,986 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 3,074 sf | 3.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 3,210 sf | 3.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 3,298 sf | 3.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 3,431 sf | 3.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 3,519 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 3,645 sf | 4.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 3,749 sf | 4.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 3,879 sf | 4.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 3,999 sf | 4.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 4,134 sf | 4.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,283 sf | 4.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 4,533 sf | 5.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,442 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,492 sf | 7.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 6:00 PM | 7,765 sf | 8.91% | 81 sf | 0.09% |
| 6:15 PM | 9,339 sf | 10.72% | 840 sf | 0.96% |
| 6:30 PM | 11,363 sf | 13.04% | 2,115 sf | 2.43% |
| 6:45 PM | 14,244 sf | 16.35% | 3,921 sf | 4.50% |
| 7:02 PM | 19,740 sf | 22.66% | 11,497 sf | 13.20% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 23

Mirror date: April 19
Analysis hours: 7:31 AM-6:52 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:31 AM | 49,794 sf | 57.16% | 5,555 sf | 6.38% |
| 7:45 AM | 35,845 sf | 41.14% | 5,990 sf | 6.88% |
| 8:00 AM | 26,999 sf | 30.99% | 5,084 sf | 5.84% |
| 8:15 AM | 21,114 sf | 24.24% | 4,292 sf | 4.93% |
| 8:30 AM | 16,082 sf | 18.46% | 3,674 sf | 4.22% |
| 8:45 AM | 12,020 sf | 13.80% | 3,182 sf | 3.65% |
| 9:00 AM | 8,672 sf | 9.95% | 2,776 sf | 3.19% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,533 sf | 7.50% | 2,192 sf | 2.52% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,083 sf | 6.98% | 646 sf | 0.74% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,739 sf | 6.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,409 sf | 6.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,131 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 4,843 sf | 5.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,602 sf | 5.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,341 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,132 sf | 4.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 3,892 sf | 4.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,696 sf | 4.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 3,471 sf | 3.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,284 sf | 3.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,059 sf | 3.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 2,867 sf | 3.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,667 sf | 3.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 2,825 sf | 3.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 2,926 sf | 3.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 3,069 sf | 3.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 3,164 sf | 3.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 3,304 sf | 3.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 3,407 sf | 3.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 3,551 sf | 4.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 3,655 sf | 4.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 3,794 sf | 4.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 3,904 sf | 4.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 4,052 sf | 4.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 4,165 sf | 4.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 4,327 sf | 4.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 4,458 sf | 5.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 4,647 sf | 5.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 4,824 sf | 5.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 5,061 sf | 5.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 5,505 sf | 6.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:45 PM | 6,760 sf | 7.76% | 168 sf | 0.19% |
| 6:00 PM | 8,184 sf | 9.39% | 1,072 sf | 1.23% |
| 6:15 PM | 9,975 sf | 11.45% | 2,417 sf | 2.77% |
| 6:30 PM | 12,345 sf | 14.17% | 4,204 sf | 4.83% |
| 6:45 PM | 16,012 sf | 18.38% | 7,130 sf | 8.18% |
| 6:52 PM | 19,022 sf | 21.83% | 11,173 sf | 12.82% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# AUGUST 30

Mirror date: April 12
Analysis hours: 7:37 AM-6:42 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:37 AM | 51,378 sf | 58.97% | 6,128 sf | 7.03% |
| 7:45 AM | 42,077 sf | 48.30% | 6,569 sf | 7.54% |
| 8:00 AM | 31,050 sf | 35.64% | 5,750 sf | 6.60% |
| 8:15 AM | 23,975 sf | 27.52% | 4,748 sf | 5.45% |
| 8:30 AM | 18,431 sf | 21.16% | 3,986 sf | 4.58% |
| 8:45 AM | 13,812 sf | 15.85% | 3,398 sf | 3.90% |
| 9:00 AM | 10,078 sf | 11.57% | 2,926 sf | 3.36% |
| 9:15 AM | 7,344 sf | 8.43% | 2,468 sf | 2.83% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,600 sf | 7.58% | 976 sf | 1.12% |
| 9:45 AM | 6,204 sf | 7.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,837 sf | 6.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,526 sf | 6.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,216 sf | 5.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,950 sf | 5.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,674 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,450 sf | 5.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,196 sf | 4.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 3,989 sf | 4.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 3,759 sf | 4.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,567 sf | 4.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,338 sf | 3.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 3,147 sf | 3.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 2,985 sf | 3.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 3,168 sf | 3.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 3,268 sf | 3.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 3,418 sf | 3.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 3,516 sf | 4.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 3,673 sf | 4.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 3,782 sf | 4.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 3,934 sf | 4.52% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 4,052 sf | 4.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 4,215 sf | 4.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 4,340 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 4,507 sf | 5.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 4,653 sf | 5.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 4,844 sf | 5.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 5,019 sf | 5.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 5,239 sf | 6.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 5,496 sf | 6.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 5,783 sf | 6.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:30 PM | 6,102 sf | 7.00% | 265 sf | 0.30% |
| 5:45 PM | 7,111 sf | 8.16% | 1,248 sf | 1.43% |
| 6:00 PM | 8,743 sf | 10.04% | 2,673 sf | 3.07% |
| 6:15 PM | 10,847 sf | 12.45% | 4,619 sf | 5.30% |
| 6:30 PM | 13,976 sf | 16.04% | 7,537 sf | 8.65% |
| 6:42 PM | 18,780 sf | 21.56% | 10,984 sf | 12.61% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 6

Mirror date: April 5
Analysis hours: 7:44 AM-6:31 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:44 AM | 51,583 sf | 59.21% | 6,349 sf | 7.29% |
| 8:00 AM | 35,558 sf | 40.82% | 6,199 sf | 7.12% |
| 8:15 AM | 27,140 sf | 31.15% | 5,098 sf | 5.85% |
| 8:30 AM | 21,004 sf | 24.11% | 4,222 sf | 4.85% |
| 8:45 AM | 15,770 sf | 18.10% | 3,569 sf | 4.10% |
| 9:00 AM | 11,600 sf | 13.32% | 3,055 sf | 3.51% |
| 9:15 AM | 8,406 sf | 9.65% | 2,619 sf | 3.01% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,169 sf | 8.23% | 1,322 sf | 1.52% |
| 9:45 AM | 6,717 sf | 7.71% | 35 sf | 0.04% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,300 sf | 7.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,963 sf | 6.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,617 sf | 6.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,334 sf | 6.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,043 sf | 5.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,802 sf | 5.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,538 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,315 sf | 4.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,074 sf | 4.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 3,874 sf | 4.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,640 sf | 4.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 3,403 sf | 3.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 3,367 sf | 3.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 3,544 sf | 4.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 3,646 sf | 4.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 3,800 sf | 4.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 3,913 sf | 4.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 4,072 sf | 4.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 4,193 sf | 4.81% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 4,370 sf | 5.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 4,501 sf | 5.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 4,683 sf | 5.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 4,830 sf | 5.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 5,036 sf | 5.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 5,217 sf | 5.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 5,444 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 5,666 sf | 6.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 5,950 sf | 6.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:00 PM | 6,254 sf | 7.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 5:15 PM | 6,630 sf | 7.61% | 396 sf | 0.45% |
| 5:30 PM | 7,134 sf | 8.19% | 1,335 sf | 1.53% |
| 5:45 PM | 7,737 sf | 8.88% | 2,848 sf | 3.27% |
| 6:00 PM | 9,498 sf | 10.90% | 4,921 sf | 5.65% |
| 6:15 PM | 12,376 sf | 14.21% | 8,246 sf | 9.46% |
| 6:31 PM | 18,770 sf | 21.54% | 13,560 sf | 15.56% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 13

Mirror date: March 29
Analysis hours: 7:50 AM-6:21 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:50 AM | 50,273 sf | 57.71% | 6,355 sf | 7.29% |
| 8:00 AM | 39,499 sf | 45.34% | 6,482 sf | 7.44% |
| 8:15 AM | 29,502 sf | 33.86% | 5,471 sf | 6.28% |
| 8:30 AM | 22,804 sf | 26.18% | 4,477 sf | 5.14% |
| 8:45 AM | 17,204 sf | 19.75% | 3,746 sf | 4.30% |
| 9:00 AM | 12,773 sf | 14.66% | 3,183 sf | 3.65% |
| 9:15 AM | 9,286 sf | 10.66% | 2,730 sf | 3.13% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,542 sf | 8.66% | 1,693 sf | 1.94% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,088 sf | 8.14% | 170 sf | 0.19% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,704 sf | 7.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,361 sf | 7.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,063 sf | 6.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,761 sf | 6.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,448 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,181 sf | 5.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,898 sf | 5.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,672 sf | 5.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,420 sf | 5.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,214 sf | 4.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 3,970 sf | 4.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 3,751 sf | 4.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 3,791 sf | 4.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 3,956 sf | 4.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 4,063 sf | 4.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 4,226 sf | 4.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 4,346 sf | 4.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 4,524 sf | 5.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 4,658 sf | 5.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 4,847 sf | 5.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 5,003 sf | 5.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 5,213 sf | 5.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 5,394 sf | 6.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 5,629 sf | 6.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 5,852 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 6,139 sf | 7.05% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 6,418 sf | 7.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:45 PM | 6,788 sf | 7.79% | 36 sf | 0.04% |
| 5:00 PM | 7,188 sf | 8.25% | 518 sf | 0.59% |
| 5:15 PM | 7,717 sf | 8.86% | 1,419 sf | 1.63% |
| 5:30 PM | 8,362 sf | 9.60% | 2,769 sf | 3.18% |
| 5:45 PM | 9,273 sf | 10.64% | 5,045 sf | 5.79% |
| 6:00 PM | 10,898 sf | 12.51% | 8,608 sf | 9.88% |
| 6:15 PM | 16,029 sf | 18.40% | 13,134 sf | 15.08% |
| 6:21 PM | 18,876 sf | 21.67% | 16,664 sf | 19.13% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 20

Fall equinox (Spring equinox on March 22 similar)
Analysis hours: 7:57 AM-6:09 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:57 AM | 48,971 sf | 56.21% | 6,393 sf | 7.34% |
| 8:00 AM | 44,700 sf | 51.31% | 6,801 sf | 7.81% |
| 8:15 AM | 32,008 sf | 36.74% | 5,865 sf | 6.73% |
| 8:30 AM | 24,397 sf | 28.00% | 4,773 sf | 5.48% |
| 8:45 AM | 18,510 sf | 21.25% | 3,953 sf | 4.54% |
| 9:00 AM | 13,724 sf | 15.75% | 3,317 sf | 3.81% |
| 9:15 AM | 9,958 sf | 11.43% | 2,829 sf | 3.25% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,589 sf | 8.71% | 2,092 sf | 2.40% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,131 sf | 8.19% | 396 sf | 0.45% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,763 sf | 7.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,427 sf | 7.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,131 sf | 7.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,854 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,600 sf | 6.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,362 sf | 6.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,141 sf | 5.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,939 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,746 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,570 sf | 5.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,334 sf | 4.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,138 sf | 4.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,241 sf | 4.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,404 sf | 5.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 4,516 sf | 5.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 4,690 sf | 5.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 4,822 sf | 5.54% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,015 sf | 5.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 5,166 sf | 5.93% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 5,381 sf | 6.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 5,564 sf | 6.39% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 5,805 sf | 6.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 6,023 sf | 6.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 6,309 sf | 7.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 6,577 sf | 7.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 6,934 sf | 7.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:30 PM | 7,307 sf | 8.39% | 99 sf | 0.11% |
| 4:45 PM | 7,784 sf | 8.93% | 546 sf | 0.63% |
| 5:00 PM | 8,321 sf | 9.55% | 1,360 sf | 1.56% |
| 5:15 PM | 9,028 sf | 10.36% | 2,637 sf | 3.03% |
| 5:30 PM | 9,912 sf | 11.38% | 4,651 sf | 5.34% |
| 5:45 PM | 11,638 sf | 13.36% | 8,117 sf | 9.32% |
| 6:00 PM | 15,343 sf | 17.61% | 13,814 sf | 15.86% |
| 6:09 PM | 19,013 sf | 21.82% | 20,103 sf | 23.08% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# SEPTEMBER 27

Mirror date: March 15
Analysis hours: 8:03 AM-5:58 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:03 AM | 47,524 sf | 54.55% | 6,398 sf | 7.34% |
| 8:15 AM | 35,019 sf | 40.20% | 6,254 sf | 7.18% |
| 8:30 AM | 26,112 sf | 29.97% | 5,127 sf | 5.89% |
| 8:45 AM | 19,923 sf | 22.87% | 4,186 sf | 4.80% |
| 9:00 AM | 14,724 sf | 16.90% | 3,480 sf | 3.99% |
| 9:15 AM | 10,705 sf | 12.29% | 2,948 sf | 3.38% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,691 sf | 8.83% | 2,458 sf | 2.82% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,111 sf | 8.16% | 685 sf | 0.79% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,725 sf | 7.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,401 sf | 7.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,116 sf | 7.02% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,852 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,614 sf | 6.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,384 sf | 6.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,178 sf | 5.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,985 sf | 5.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,796 sf | 5.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,613 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,431 sf | 5.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,341 sf | 4.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,541 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,738 sf | 5.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 4,926 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,135 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,340 sf | 6.13% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,552 sf | 6.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 5,727 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 5,966 sf | 6.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 6,182 sf | 7.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 6,460 sf | 7.42% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 6,727 sf | 7.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 7,066 sf | 8.11% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 7,407 sf | 8.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:15 PM | 7,852 sf | 9.01% | 143 sf | 0.16% |
| 4:30 PM | 8,332 sf | 9.56% | 511 sf | 0.59% |
| 4:45 PM | 8,956 sf | 10.28% | 1,221 sf | 1.40% |
| 5:00 PM | 9,677 sf | 11.11% | 2,395 sf | 2.75% |
| 5:15 PM | 10,670 sf | 12.25% | 4,275 sf | 4.91% |
| 5:30 PM | 12,408 sf | 14.24% | 7,222 sf | 8.29% |
| 5:45 PM | 15,944 sf | 18.30% | 12,848 sf | 14.75% |
| 5:58 PM | 21,172 sf | 24.30% | 22,202 sf | 25.48% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 4

Mirror date: March 8
Analysis hours: 8:09 AM-5:47 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:09 AM | 46,677 sf | 53.58% | 6,434 sf | 7.39% |
| 8:15 AM | 40,180 sf | 46.12% | 6,501 sf | 7.46% |
| 8:30 AM | 28,410 sf | 32.61% | 5,559 sf | 6.38% |
| 8:45 AM | 21,439 sf | 24.61% | 4,472 sf | 5.13% |
| 9:00 AM | 15,853 sf | 18.20% | 3,693 sf | 4.24% |
| 9:15 AM | 11,527 sf | 13.23% | 3,094 sf | 3.55% |
| 9:30 AM | 8,163 sf | 9.37% | 2,599 sf | 2.98% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,075 sf | 8.12% | 1,070 sf | 1.23% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,698 sf | 7.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,372 sf | 7.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,088 sf | 6.99% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,824 sf | 6.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,583 sf | 6.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,360 sf | 6.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,154 sf | 5.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,957 sf | 5.69% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,789 sf | 5.50% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,620 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,443 sf | 5.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,424 sf | 5.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,643 sf | 5.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,875 sf | 5.60% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 5,088 sf | 5.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,312 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,537 sf | 6.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,795 sf | 6.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 6,050 sf | 6.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 6,350 sf | 7.29% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 6,654 sf | 7.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 7,007 sf | 8.04% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 7,384 sf | 8.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 7,820 sf | 8.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 4:00 PM | 8,307 sf | 9.53% | 119 sf | 0.14% |
| 4:15 PM | 8,892 sf | 10.21% | 440 sf | 0.51% |
| 4:30 PM | 9,517 sf | 10.92% | 1,000 sf | 1.15% |
| 4:45 PM | 10,337 sf | 11.87% | 2,078 sf | 2.38% |
| 5:00 PM | 11,321 sf | 12.99% | 3,797 sf | 4.36% |
| 5:15 PM | 13,160 sf | 15.11% | 6,402 sf | 7.35% |
| 5:30 PM | 16,396 sf | 18.82% | 11,567 sf | 13.28% |
| 5:47 PM | 23,202 sf | 26.63% | 23,546 sf | 27.03% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 11

Mirror date: March 1
Analysis hours: 8:16 AM-5:37 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:16 AM | 47,593 sf | 54.63% | 6,445 sf | 7.40% |
| 8:30 AM | 31,988 sf | 36.72% | 5,996 sf | 6.88% |
| 8:45 AM | 23,183 sf | 26.61% | 4,817 sf | 5.53% |
| 9:00 AM | 17,155 sf | 19.69% | 3,926 sf | 4.51% |
| 9:15 AM | 12,468 sf | 14.31% | 3,266 sf | 3.75% |
| 9:30 AM | 8,774 sf | 10.07% | 2,746 sf | 3.15% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,044 sf | 8.09% | 1,531 sf | 1.76% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,662 sf | 7.65% | 24 sf | 0.03% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,337 sf | 7.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,058 sf | 6.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,801 sf | 6.66% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,559 sf | 6.38% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,335 sf | 6.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,131 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,938 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,769 sf | 5.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,596 sf | 5.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,406 sf | 5.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,524 sf | 5.19% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,743 sf | 5.44% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 4,969 sf | 5.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 5,188 sf | 5.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,424 sf | 6.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,675 sf | 6.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 5,950 sf | 6.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 6,247 sf | 7.17% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 6,560 sf | 7.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 6,900 sf | 7.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 7,286 sf | 8.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 7,703 sf | 8.84% | 1 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:45 PM | 8,189 sf | 9.40% | 73 sf | 0.08% |
| 4:00 PM | 8,745 sf | 10.04% | 319 sf | 0.37% |
| 4:15 PM | 9,415 sf | 10.81% | 762 sf | 0.87% |
| 4:30 PM | 10,214 sf | 11.72% | 1,657 sf | 1.90% |
| 4:45 PM | 11,226 sf | 12.89% | 3,291 sf | 3.78% |
| 5:00 PM | 12,880 sf | 14.78% | 5,580 sf | 6.41% |
| 5:15 PM | 15,792 sf | 18.13% | 10,343 sf | 11.87% |
| 5:30 PM | 20,669 sf | 23.72% | 18,729 sf | 21.50% |
| 5:37 PM | 24,126 sf | 27.69% | 23,682 sf | 27.18% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 18

Mirror date: February 22
Analysis hours: 8:22 AM-5:27 PM (PDT)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:22 AM | 49,356 sf | 56.65% | 6,407 sf | 7.35% |
| 8:30 AM | 39,444 sf | 45.28% | 6,313 sf | 7.25% |
| 8:45 AM | 26,211 sf | 30.09% | 5,247 sf | 6.02% |
| 9:00 AM | 18,682 sf | 21.44% | 4,215 sf | 4.84% |
| 9:15 AM | 13,562 sf | 15.57% | 3,469 sf | 3.98% |
| 9:30 AM | 9,551 sf | 10.96% | 2,890 sf | 3.32% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,027 sf | 8.07% | 2,062 sf | 2.37% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,625 sf | 7.60% | 188 sf | 0.22% |
| 10:15 AM | 6,299 sf | 7.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 6,024 sf | 6.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,767 sf | 6.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 5,537 sf | 6.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 5,315 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 5,111 sf | 5.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,923 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,755 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 4,595 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 4,416 sf | 5.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 4,591 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 4,820 sf | 5.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 5,051 sf | 5.80% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 5,281 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 5,528 sf | 6.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 5,787 sf | 6.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 6,079 sf | 6.98% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 6,391 sf | 7.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 6,728 sf | 7.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:00 PM | 7,097 sf | 8.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:15 PM | 7,511 sf | 8.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 3:30 PM | 7,978 sf | 9.16% | 15 sf | 0.02% |
| 3:45 PM | 8,511 sf | 9.77% | 190 sf | 0.22% |
| 4:00 PM | 9,128 sf | 10.48% | 492 sf | 0.57% |
| 4:15 PM | 9,887 sf | 11.35% | 1,215 sf | 1.39% |
| 4:30 PM | 10,804 sf | 12.40% | 2,651 sf | 3.04% |
| 4:45 PM | 12,255 sf | 14.07% | 4,803 sf | 5.51% |
| 5:00 PM | 14,625 sf | 16.79% | 8,955 sf | 10.28% |
| 5:15 PM | 18,254 sf | 20.95% | 15,624 sf | 17.93% |
| 5:27 PM | 24,202 sf | 27.78% | 22,907 sf | 26.29% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# OCTOBER 25

Mirror date: February 15
Analysis hours: 7:30 AM-4:18 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:30 AM | 51,336 sf | 58.93% | 5,893 sf | 6.76% |
| 7:45 AM | 32,576 sf | 37.39% | 5,790 sf | 6.65% |
| 8:00 AM | 21,547 sf | 24.73% | 4,568 sf | 5.24% |
| 8:15 AM | 14,922 sf | 17.13% | 3,712 sf | 4.26% |
| 8:30 AM | 10,530 sf | 12.09% | 3,061 sf | 3.51% |
| 8:45 AM | 7,289 sf | 8.37% | 2,511 sf | 2.88% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,606 sf | 7.58% | 571 sf | 0.66% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,272 sf | 7.20% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,002 sf | 6.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,744 sf | 6.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,513 sf | 6.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,299 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,090 sf | 5.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,910 sf | 5.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,749 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,593 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,439 sf | 5.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,654 sf | 5.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,885 sf | 5.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,128 sf | 5.89% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,367 sf | 6.16% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,624 sf | 6.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 5,896 sf | 6.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,202 sf | 7.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,528 sf | 7.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 6,893 sf | 7.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,282 sf | 8.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 7,731 sf | 8.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,229 sf | 9.45% | 97 sf | 0.11% |
| 2:45 PM | 8,819 sf | 10.12% | 291 sf | 0.33% |
| 3:00 PM | 9,500 sf | 10.90% | 715 sf | 0.82% |
| 3:15 PM | 10,350 sf | 11.88% | 1,914 sf | 2.20% |
| 3:30 PM | 11,536 sf | 13.24% | 3,813 sf | 4.38% |
| 3:45 PM | 13,493 sf | 15.49% | 7,533 sf | 8.65% |
| 4:00 PM | 16,681 sf | 19.15% | 13,991 sf | 16.06% |
| 4:15 PM | 22,420 sf | 25.73% | 20,793 sf | 23.87% |
| 4:18 PM | 24,096 sf | 27.66% | 21,706 sf | 24.92% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 1

Mirror date: February 8
Analysis hours: 7:36 AM-4:10 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:36 AM | 53,393 sf | 61.29% | 5,303 sf | 6.09% |
| 7:45 AM | 41,612 sf | 47.76% | 5,811 sf | 6.67% |
| 8:00 AM | 27,149 sf | 31.16% | 5,000 sf | 5.74% |
| 8:15 AM | 17,945 sf | 20.60% | 4,002 sf | 4.59% |
| 8:30 AM | 11,806 sf | 13.55% | 3,269 sf | 3.75% |
| 8:45 AM | 8,030 sf | 9.22% | 2,706 sf | 3.11% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,601 sf | 7.58% | 1,129 sf | 1.30% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,254 sf | 7.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,977 sf | 6.86% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,727 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,495 sf | 6.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,284 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,080 sf | 5.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,898 sf | 5.62% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,748 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,591 sf | 5.27% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,485 sf | 5.15% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,705 sf | 5.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,947 sf | 5.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,195 sf | 5.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,445 sf | 6.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,714 sf | 6.56% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 5,988 sf | 6.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,314 sf | 7.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,654 sf | 7.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,036 sf | 8.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,451 sf | 8.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 7,934 sf | 9.11% | 28 sf | 0.03% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,468 sf | 9.72% | 119 sf | 0.14% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,107 sf | 10.45% | 266 sf | 0.31% |
| 3:00 PM | 9,853 sf | 11.31% | 1,111 sf | 1.27% |
| 3:15 PM | 10,863 sf | 12.47% | 2,800 sf | 3.21% |
| 3:30 PM | 12,362 sf | 14.19% | 5,846 sf | 6.71% |
| 3:45 PM | 14,775 sf | 16.96% | 11,579 sf | 13.29% |
| 4:00 PM | 19,191 sf | 22.03% | 17,790 sf | 20.42% |
| 4:10 PM | 24,483 sf | 28.10% | 19,556 sf | 22.45% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 8

Mirror date: February 1
Analysis hours: 7:43 AM-4:03 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:43 AM | 55,430 sf | 63.63% | 4,886 sf | 5.61% |
| 7:45 AM | 53,511 sf | 61.42% | 5,070 sf | 5.82% |
| 8:00 AM | 34,979 sf | 40.15% | 5,259 sf | 6.04% |
| 8:15 AM | 23,271 sf | 26.71% | 4,374 sf | 5.02% |
| 8:30 AM | 14,809 sf | 17.00% | 3,524 sf | 4.05% |
| 8:45 AM | 9,424 sf | 10.82% | 2,883 sf | 3.31% |
| 9:00 AM | 6,613 sf | 7.59% | 1,811 sf | 2.08% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,252 sf | 7.18% | 25 sf | 0.03% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,968 sf | 6.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,720 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,492 sf | 6.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,276 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,077 sf | 5.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,901 sf | 5.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,755 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,604 sf | 5.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,514 sf | 5.18% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,744 sf | 5.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,994 sf | 5.73% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,251 sf | 6.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,503 sf | 6.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,784 sf | 6.64% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,066 sf | 6.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,401 sf | 7.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,760 sf | 7.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,173 sf | 8.23% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,601 sf | 8.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,104 sf | 9.30% | 16 sf | 0.02% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,672 sf | 9.95% | 83 sf | 0.10% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,355 sf | 10.74% | 377 sf | 0.43% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,167 sf | 11.67% | 1,621 sf | 1.86% |
| 3:15 PM | 11,341 sf | 13.02% | 4,143 sf | 4.76% |
| 3:30 PM | 13,065 sf | 15.00% | 8,806 sf | 10.11% |
| 3:45 PM | 16,324 sf | 18.74% | 14,673 sf | 16.84% |
| 4:00 PM | 24,209 sf | 27.79% | 17,105 sf | 19.63% |
| 4:03 PM | 27,281 sf | 31.31% | 16,856 sf | 19.35% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 15

Mirror date: January 25
Analysis hours: 7:51 AM-3:57 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:51 AM | 57,456 sf | 65.95% | 4,431 sf | 5.09% |
| 8:00 AM | 44,494 sf | 51.07% | 5,133 sf | 5.89% |
| 8:15 AM | 29,993 sf | 34.43% | 4,572 sf | 5.25% |
| 8:30 AM | 19,421 sf | 22.29% | 3,823 sf | 4.39% |
| 8:45 AM | 12,326 sf | 14.15% | 3,104 sf | 3.56% |
| 9:00 AM | 7,383 sf | 8.47% | 2,508 sf | 2.88% |
| 9:15 AM | 6,271 sf | 7.20% | 368 sf | 0.42% |
| 9:30 AM | 5,967 sf | 6.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,723 sf | 6.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,494 sf | 6.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,282 sf | 6.06% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,082 sf | 5.83% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,904 sf | 5.63% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,764 sf | 5.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,619 sf | 5.30% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,538 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,772 sf | 5.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,029 sf | 5.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,292 sf | 6.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,552 sf | 6.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,835 sf | 6.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,127 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,471 sf | 7.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,838 sf | 7.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,253 sf | 8.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,709 sf | 8.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,235 sf | 9.45% | 4 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,834 sf | 10.14% | 54 sf | 0.06% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,552 sf | 10.96% | 602 sf | 0.69% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,422 sf | 11.96% | 2,338 sf | 2.68% |
| 3:15 PM | 11,766 sf | 13.51% | 5,933 sf | 6.81% |
| 3:30 PM | 13,946 sf | 16.01% | 11,220 sf | 12.88% |
| 3:45 PM | 19,955 sf | 22.91% | 14,991 sf | 17.21% |
| 3:57 PM | 31,138 sf | 35.74% | 14,108 sf | 16.19% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 22

Mirror date: January 18
Analysis hours: 7:57 AM-3:54 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 7:57 AM | 59,462 sf | 68.25% | 4,024 sf | 4.62% |
| 8:00 AM | 56,106 sf | 64.40% | 4,258 sf | 4.89% |
| 8:15 AM | 37,839 sf | 43.43% | 4,598 sf | 5.28% |
| 8:30 AM | 25,145 sf | 28.86% | 4,022 sf | 4.62% |
| 8:45 AM | 16,356 sf | 18.77% | 3,360 sf | 3.86% |
| 9:00 AM | 9,898 sf | 11.36% | 2,721 sf | 3.12% |
| 9:15 AM | 7,077 sf | 8.12% | 1,031 sf | 1.18% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,019 sf | 6.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,735 sf | 6.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,508 sf | 6.32% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,293 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,094 sf | 5.85% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,921 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,782 sf | 5.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,642 sf | 5.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,551 sf | 5.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,786 sf | 5.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,042 sf | 5.79% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,311 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,580 sf | 6.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,869 sf | 6.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,165 sf | 7.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,509 sf | 7.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,887 sf | 7.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,318 sf | 8.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,785 sf | 8.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,321 sf | 9.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,937 sf | 10.26% | 31 sf | 0.04% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,680 sf | 11.11% | 824 sf | 0.95% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,624 sf | 12.20% | 3,146 sf | 3.61% |
| 3:15 PM | 12,246 sf | 14.06% | 7,550 sf | 8.67% |
| 3:30 PM | 15,814 sf | 18.15% | 12,449 sf | 14.29% |
| 3:45 PM | 24,777 sf | 28.44% | 13,761 sf | 15.80% |
| 3:54 PM | 34,860 sf | 40.01% | 11,627 sf | 13.35% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# NOVEMBER 29

Mirror date: January 11
Analysis hours: 8:04 AM-3:51 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:04 AM | 60,975 sf | 69.99% | 3,790 sf | 4.35% |
| 8:15 AM | 46,327 sf | 53.18% | 4,521 sf | 5.19% |
| 8:30 AM | 31,415 sf | 36.06% | 4,084 sf | 4.69% |
| 8:45 AM | 20,984 sf | 24.09% | 3,555 sf | 4.08% |
| 9:00 AM | 13,129 sf | 15.07% | 2,935 sf | 3.37% |
| 9:15 AM | 8,485 sf | 9.74% | 1,824 sf | 2.09% |
| 9:30 AM | 6,811 sf | 7.82% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 5,872 sf | 6.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,532 sf | 6.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,316 sf | 6.10% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,117 sf | 5.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,940 sf | 5.67% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,804 sf | 5.51% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,670 sf | 5.36% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,546 sf | 5.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,759 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,000 sf | 5.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,294 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,585 sf | 6.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,879 sf | 6.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,178 sf | 7.09% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,517 sf | 7.48% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,904 sf | 7.92% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,335 sf | 8.42% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,810 sf | 8.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,358 sf | 9.59% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,980 sf | 10.31% | 24 sf | 0.03% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,745 sf | 11.19% | 1,069 sf | 1.23% |
| 3:00 PM | 10,930 sf | 12.55% | 3,847 sf | 4.42% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,003 sf | 14.93% | 8,515 sf | 9.77% |
| 3:30 PM | 17,870 sf | 20.51% | 12,500 sf | 14.35% |
| 3:45 PM | 29,585 sf | 33.96% | 12,017 sf | 13.79% |
| 3:51 PM | 38,226 sf | 43.88% | 9,782 sf | 11.23% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# DECEMBER 6

Mirror date: January 4
Analysis hours: 8:10 AM-3:51 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:10 AM | 62,077 sf | 71.25% | 3,623 sf | 4.16% |
| 8:15 AM | 55,171 sf | 63.33% | 3,964 sf | 4.55% |
| 8:30 AM | 37,834 sf | 43.43% | 4,133 sf | 4.74% |
| 8:45 AM | 25,717 sf | 29.52% | 3,623 sf | 4.16% |
| 9:00 AM | 16,650 sf | 19.11% | 3,157 sf | 3.62% |
| 9:15 AM | 10,386 sf | 11.92% | 2,530 sf | 2.90% |
| 9:30 AM | 7,843 sf | 9.00% | 260 sf | 0.30% |
| 9:45 AM | 6,564 sf | 7.53% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 5,653 sf | 6.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,348 sf | 6.14% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,150 sf | 5.91% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,967 sf | 5.70% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,834 sf | 5.55% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,701 sf | 5.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,542 sf | 5.21% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,757 sf | 5.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 5,024 sf | 5.77% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,298 sf | 6.08% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,573 sf | 6.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,859 sf | 6.72% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,163 sf | 7.07% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,497 sf | 7.46% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,881 sf | 7.90% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,318 sf | 8.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,793 sf | 8.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,341 sf | 9.57% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,961 sf | 10.29% | 23 sf | 0.03% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,870 sf | 11.33% | 1,182 sf | 1.36% |
| 3:00 PM | 11,182 sf | 12.83% | 4,220 sf | 4.84% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,645 sf | 15.66% | 8,831 sf | 10.14% |
| 3:30 PM | 19,347 sf | 22.21% | 12,156 sf | 13.95% |
| 3:45 PM | 32,446 sf | 37.24% | 10,874 sf | 12.48% |
| 3:51 PM | 41,983 sf | 48.19% | 7,815 sf | 8.97% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# DECEMBER 13

Mirror date: December 28
Analysis hours: 8:15 AM-3:52 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key
Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:15 AM | 62,797 sf | 72.08% | 3,498 sf | 4.02% |
| 8:30 AM | 44,071 sf | 50.59% | 4,120 sf | 4.73% |
| 8:45 AM | 30,241 sf | 34.71% | 3,724 sf | 4.27% |
| 9:00 AM | 19,954 sf | 22.90% | 3,236 sf | 3.71% |
| 9:15 AM | 12,851 sf | 14.75% | 2,723 sf | 3.13% |
| 9:30 AM | 8,805 sf | 10.11% | 869 sf | 1.00% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,255 sf | 8.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,109 sf | 7.01% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,439 sf | 6.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,186 sf | 5.95% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 4,998 sf | 5.74% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,857 sf | 5.58% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,731 sf | 5.43% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,548 sf | 5.22% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,709 sf | 5.40% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,976 sf | 5.71% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,253 sf | 6.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,528 sf | 6.35% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,821 sf | 6.68% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,123 sf | 7.03% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,454 sf | 7.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,831 sf | 7.84% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,258 sf | 8.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,731 sf | 8.87% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,270 sf | 9.49% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,933 sf | 10.25% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,859 sf | 11.32% | 1,062 sf | 1.22% |
| 3:00 PM | 11,281 sf | 12.95% | 4,068 sf | 4.67% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,808 sf | 15.85% | 8,530 sf | 9.79% |
| 3:30 PM | 19,540 sf | 22.43% | 11,753 sf | 13.49% |
| 3:45 PM | 32,452 sf | 37.25% | 10,549 sf | 12.11% |
| 3:52 PM | 44,996 sf | 51.65% | 6,232 sf | 7.15% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**
Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



PROJECT: Family Zoning Plan
OPEN SPACE: Joe DiMaggio (87,120 sf)

# DECEMBER 20

Winter solstice (December 21 similar)
Analysis hours: 8:19 AM-3:54 PM (PST)

Shadow / Sunlight Balance Key

Existing Shadow | Project Shadow | Sunlight Remaining

| Analysis Time | EXISTING SHADOW | | PROJECT NET NEW SHADOW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shadow Area | Coverage | Shadow Area | Coverage |
| 8:19 AM | 63,052 sf | 72.37% | 3,457 sf | 3.97% |
| 8:30 AM | 49,142 sf | 56.41% | 4,080 sf | 4.68% |
| 8:45 AM | 34,003 sf | 39.03% | 3,810 sf | 4.37% |
| 9:00 AM | 22,611 sf | 25.95% | 3,341 sf | 3.83% |
| 9:15 AM | 14,836 sf | 17.03% | 2,875 sf | 3.30% |
| 9:30 AM | 9,679 sf | 11.11% | 1,488 sf | 1.71% |
| 9:45 AM | 7,787 sf | 8.94% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:00 AM | 6,454 sf | 7.41% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:15 AM | 5,621 sf | 6.45% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:30 AM | 5,229 sf | 6.00% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 10:45 AM | 5,039 sf | 5.78% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:00 AM | 4,883 sf | 5.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:15 AM | 4,765 sf | 5.47% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:30 AM | 4,623 sf | 5.31% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 11:45 AM | 4,656 sf | 5.34% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:00 PM | 4,923 sf | 5.65% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:15 PM | 5,200 sf | 5.97% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:30 PM | 5,472 sf | 6.28% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 12:45 PM | 5,762 sf | 6.61% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:00 PM | 6,064 sf | 6.96% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:15 PM | 6,389 sf | 7.33% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:30 PM | 6,753 sf | 7.75% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 1:45 PM | 7,175 sf | 8.24% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:00 PM | 7,635 sf | 8.76% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:15 PM | 8,165 sf | 9.37% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:30 PM | 8,816 sf | 10.12% | 0 sf | 0.00% |
| 2:45 PM | 9,715 sf | 11.15% | 772 sf | 0.89% |
| 3:00 PM | 11,060 sf | 12.70% | 3,478 sf | 3.99% |
| 3:15 PM | 13,417 sf | 15.40% | 7,731 sf | 8.87% |
| 3:30 PM | 18,450 sf | 21.18% | 11,434 sf | 13.12% |
| 3:45 PM | 30,188 sf | 34.65% | 10,821 sf | 12.42% |
| 3:54 PM | 46,296 sf | 53.14% | 5,558 sf | 6.38% |

**SHADOW/SUNLIGHT BALANCE**

Relative levels of Shadow vs. Sun



# EXHIBIT E

SWAPE Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Matt Hagemann, P.G, C.Hg.
(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

November 14, 2025

Richard Drury
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612

**Subject:** **Comments on the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program (SCH No. 2021060358)**

Dear Mr. Drury,

We have reviewed the September 2025 Addendum No. 1 to Environmental Impact Report ("Addendum") and the November 2022 Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Family Zoning Plan – Housing Element Rezoning Program ("Project") located in the City of San Francisco ("City"). The Addendum proposes to develop an additional 4,000 housing units to bring the total units under the Family Zoning Plan to 54,000 housing units.

Our review concludes that the Addendum fails to adequately evaluate the Project's hazards, hazardous materials, and air quality impacts. As a result, emissions and health risk impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project may be underestimated and inadequately addressed. A subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") should be prepared to adequately assess and mitigate the potential hazards, hazardous materials, and air quality impacts that the project may have on the environment.

# Hazards and Hazardous Materials

## Inadequate Disclosure and Analysis of Impacts

The Addendum and FEIR do not mention the newly passed AB 130 which mandates that hazardous waste sites be addressed through the completion of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessments ("ESAs"). AB 130 states: [1]

> "The development can proceed as a "use by right" if, [among other provisions],

[1] "Assembly Bill No. 130." California State Legislature, 2025, *available at:* https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB130/id/3258333

(13) (A) The development proponent completes a Phase I environmental assessment, as defined in Section 78090 of the Health and Safety Code, and a Phase II environmental assessment, as defined in subdivision (o) of Section 25403 of the Health and Safety Code, if warranted.

(B) If a recognized environmental condition is found, the development proponent shall undertake a preliminary endangerment assessment, as defined in Section 78095 of the Health and Safety Code, prepared by an environmental assessor to determine the existence of any release of a hazardous substance on the site and to determine the potential for exposure of future occupants to significant health hazards from any nearby property or activity.

(i) If a release of hazardous substance is found to exist on the site, the release shall be removed, or any significant effect of the release shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with state and federal requirements.

(ii) If a potential for exposure to significant hazards from surrounding properties or activities is found to exist, the effects of the potential exposure shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with current state and federal requirements."

These requirements are not mentioned in the Addendum or FEIR. There are thousands of hazardous waste sites in San Francisco. According to the FEIR, there are 2,000 Maher sites and 2,300 Cortese List sites within San Francisco (p. 4.1-219) [2]. All Maher- and Cortese-listed sites that will be subject to development under this Project will need to undergo a Phase I ESA according to the AB 130 text cited above.

Phase I ESAs are conducted to identify if any recognized environmental conditions are found that would potentially pose a health risk to construction workers or for future residents. If a recognized environmental condition is found, a more detailed preliminary endangerment assessment is required to identify any hazardous substance release.

A subsequent EIR should be prepared to include specific mitigation measures for dealing with Maher- and Cortese-listed sites in a manner consistent with AB 130. These mitigation measures must include provisions for conducting Phase I ESAs and, if recognized conditions are found, Phase II ESAs so that the health of construction workers, future occupants and workers is protected.

[2] The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agencyopens in a new window to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. DTSC is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other State and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/

## Air Quality

### Failure to Quantify and Adequately Evaluate Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

The Addendum fails to quantify the criteria air pollutant emissions associated with Project construction and operation. Rather, in regard to the proposed Project's construction-related air quality impacts, the Addendum states:

> "The proposed rezoning program and subsequent development is expected to result in the same significant criteria air pollutant impacts from construction but not substantially more severe impacts than those disclosed in the EIR" (p. 93).

Similarly, in regard to the Project's operational air quality impacts, the Addendum states:

> "The conclusion in the FEIR is that total operational emissions for future development would be below the air district's thresholds of significance for all pollutants. That conclusion also applies to the proposed rezoning program. Operational emissions would not exceed any thresholds for any representative building type that would be constructed under the proposed rezoning program, and the impact would be less than significant" (p. 95).

However, relevant Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("BAAQMD") guidance supports the calculation of the Project's air pollutant emissions. The Addendum proposes to construct an additional 4,000 residential units. According to BAAQMD's screening criteria, apartments and condo-townhouse land uses must undergo further environmental review if they exceed 416 units for construction or 637/638 units for operational emissions (see table below).[3]

[3] "Screening For Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors." BAAQMD, 2022, *available at*: https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-4-screening_final-pdf.pdf?la=en, p. 4.

| Land Use Category | Land Use Subcategory | Land Use Unit | Screening Level | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Construction | Operation |
| Education | Worship Place | KSF | 452 | 642 |
| Industrial | General Heavy Industry | KSF | 452 | 1,009 |
| Industrial | General Light Industry | KSF | 452 | 998 |
| Industrial | Industrial Park | KSF | 452 | 1,247 |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | KSF | 452 | 1,009 |
| Industrial | Warehouse[1] | KSF | 452 | 1,423 |
| Recreational | Arena | KSF | 732 | 600 |
| Recreational | City Park | Acres | 10 | 175 |
| Recreational | Fast Food Restaurant | KSF | 452 | 21 |
| Recreational | Health Club | KSF | 452 | 261 |
| Recreational | Hotel | Rooms | 312 | 633 |
| Recreational | Motel | Rooms | 230 | 767 |
| Recreational | Movie Theater | KSF | 458 | 80 |
| Recreational | Restaurant – High Turnover (Sit-Down) | KSF | 452 | 75 |
| Recreational | Restaurant – Quality (Fine Dining) | KSF | 452 | 105 |
| Recreational | Racquet Club | KSF | 452 | 457 |
| Recreational | Recreational Swimming Pool | KSF | 452 | 376 |
| Residential | Apartments | DU | 416 | 638 |
| Residential | Condo-Townhouse | DU | 416 | 637 |
| Residential | Mobile Home Park | DU | 377 | 721 |
| Residential | Congregate Care/Retirement Community | DU | 416 | 1,008 |
| Residential | Single Family Housing | DU | 254 | 421 |
| Retail | Auto Care Center | KSF | 452 | 356 |
| Retail | Convenience Market | KSF | 452 | 11 |
| Retail | Discount Store | KSF | 452 | 150 |
| Retail | Home Improvement Superstore/Hardware-Paint Store | KSF | 452 | 221 |
| Retail | Regional Shopping Center | KSF | 452 | 221 |
| Retail | Strip Mall | KSF | 452 | 204 |
| Retail | Supermarket | KSF | 452 | 72 |

Notes: DU = dwelling unit; KSF = thousand square feet.

Furthermore, the BAAQMD indicates that if a Project includes any of the listed screening criteria, "then the lead agency would need to perform a detailed assessment of the project's criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions."[4] Thus, pursuant to relevant BAAQMD guidance, a quantitative air quality analysis should be prepared in a subsequent EIR.

Without making an effort to estimate the Project's potential construction-related and operational criteria air pollutant emissions, the Addendum lacks evidence to support the conclusion that the Project's emissions would not exceed the applicable BAAQMD significance thresholds. Until further analysis is provided, we cannot verify the Project would not result in new, significant air quality impacts already addressed in the FEIR. The Project should not be approved until a subsequent EIR is prepared to adequately assess and mitigate the potential air quality impacts that Project construction and operation may have on the surrounding environment.

## SWAPE's Analysis Indicates a Potentially Significant Air Quality Impact

In an effort to estimate construction-related and operational emissions that may result from development of the additional 4,000 housing units under the Addendum, we prepared a preliminary CalEEMod model. Our analysis provides a generalized evaluation of a range of potential residential building types. Specifically, we modeled accounting for 2,000 "Apartments Mid Rise" and 2,000

[4] "Screening For Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors." BAAQMD, 2022, *available at*: https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-4-screening_final-pdf.pdf?la=en, p. 4.

"Condo/Townhouse High Rise" land use subtypes. Because Project-specific details such as construction schedule, equipment types, and operating parameters are not known at this time, all other values were left as default.

Our analysis estimates that the Project's construction and operational related reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds ("ROG/VOC") emissions exceed the BAAQMD daily threshold of 54 pounds per day ("lbs/day") (see table below).

| SWAPE Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Estimates | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Construction ROG/VOC** (lbs/day) | **Operational ROG/VOC** (lbs/day) |
| SWAPE | 148 | 145 |
| **BAAQMD Threshold** | **54** | **54** |
| *Exceeds?* | ***Yes*** | ***Yes*** |

According to our analysis, the construction and operational related ROG/VOC emissions are estimated to be approximately 148 and 145 lbs/day, respectively, exceeding the BAAQMD daily threshold. This finding indicates a potentially significant air quality impact that the Addendum did not identify or address. In our opinion, a subsequent EIR should be conducted to provide a more substantial calculation of the Project's emissions and a more detailed evaluation of the Project's potential air quality impacts.

## Failure to Adequately Account for Air Pollution Exposure Zones

The Addendum proposes development in the Downtown, Marina, Mission, Northeast, and Western Addition planning districts, which have areas within the City's air pollutant exposure zones ("APEZ"). The Addendum states that "the proposed rezoning program may result in a small proportion of additional rezoned parcels being in the APEZ, which could increase the number of people exposed to the generally high pollutant concentrations in the APEZ" (p. 97).

In 2025, the City identified new APEZ areas, defined as locations "where particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) is greater than or equal to 9 $\mu g/m^3$ or where the risk of cancer from air pollutants is greater than or equal to 100 in a million," and are displayed in the APEZ map presented below:[5]

[5] "2025 Air Pollutant Exposure Zone." San Francisco Department of Public Health, February 2025, available at: https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/SharedLinks.aspx?accesskey=216571d03e991ee3e00bc434a2415eb36eabc17a8f25a39dc8105f404b976d2f&VaultGUID=A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0.




According to the City:

> "Since 2008, San Francisco Health Code article 38 requires new residential construction projects in the APEZ to install enhanced ventilation in buildings to protect residents from the health effects of poor air quality. In addition, through the environmental review process, many construction projects in the APEZ are required to use the cleanest available construction equipment to reduce air quality impacts."[6][7]

As demonstrated above, residential projects are recommended to install enhanced ventilation in buildings. The Addendum and FEIR have failed to do so. Additionally, the Addendum concludes that the $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk impacts associated with the Project would be significant-and-unavoidable with mitigation, stating:

> "The maximum increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and cancer risks would not be meaningfully different than those found in the FEIR analysis, and the results would most likely still be above the air district's thresholds and thus significant and unavoidable with mitigation" (p. 97).

While we agree that the Project would result in significant air quality impacts, the Addendum's assertion that this impact is significant-and-unavoidable is unsupported. The Project proposed by the Addendum would allow further residential development within newly designated APEZ areas, which are already characterized by elevated $PM_{2.5}$ levels and an increased cancer risk. By facilitating new housing in these

[6] "Air Quality Review." San Francisco Planning, 2025, *available at:* https://sfplanning.org/air-quality#permit-anchor-3.
[7] "ARTICLE 38: Enhanced Ventilation for Urban Infill." City and County of San Francisco, December 2008, *available at: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_health/0-0-0-6054*.

areas without committing to additional mitigation, the Addendum could expose future residents to potentially significant health impacts. According to CEQA Guidelines §15096(g)(2):

> "When an updated EIR has been prepared for a project, the Responsible Agency shall not approve the project as proposed if the agency finds any feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures within its powers that would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the project would have on the environment."[8]

As such, the Addendum is required under CEQA to implement all feasible mitigation to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. To reduce the Project's air quality impacts to the maximum extent possible, additional feasible mitigation measures should be incorporated, such as those suggested in the section of this letter titled "Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Emissions." The Project should not be approved until a subsequent EIR is prepared, incorporating all feasible mitigation to reduce emissions to the maximum extent possible.

# Mitigation

## Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Emissions

The Addendum is required under CEQA to implement all feasible mitigation to reduce the Project's potential impacts. As demonstrated above, the Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts that should be mitigated further.

To reduce the VOC emissions associated with Project construction and operation, we recommend the Addendum consider incorporating the following mitigation measures:[9]

- Use super-compliant VOC-content architectural coatings (0 grams per liter to less than 10 grams per liter VOC) during Project construction application of paints and other architectural coatings.
- If paints and coatings with VOC content of 0 grams/liter to less than 10 grams/liter cannot be utilized, or they do not reduce emissions to below thresholds, the developer shall avoid application of architectural coatings during the peak smog season: July, August, and September.

While the Project is not located in Los Angeles County, the above mitigation measures would decrease emissions regardless. Further mitigation used by other land use development projects to address VOC emissions include:[10]

---

[8] "Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15096." California Legislature, available at: https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-14-natural-resources/division-6-resources-agency/chapter-3-guidelines-for-implementation-of-the-california-environmental-quality-act/article-7-eir-process/section-15096-process-for-a-responsible-agency.

[9] "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program." Los Angeles County Housing Element Update Program EIR. August 2021, *available at*: https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Housing_final-peir-mitigation-monitoring.pdf.

[10] "Banning Commerce Center Project." Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., June 2024, *available at*: https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2022090102/2; Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 1-7.

- Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.
- Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.
- For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain
- Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.
- Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.
- Manual application using a paintbrush, hand-roller, trowel, spatula, dauber, rag, or sponge, to achieve a 100 percent application efficiency.

In order to reduce the $PM_{2.5}$ and cancer risk emissions associated with the Project and recommend the Addendum consider incorporating several mitigation measures as listed below. Incorporating these measures would also reduce cumulative exposure for future residential developments proposed within APEZ zones, where pollutant concentrations are already elevated. The Southern California Association of Governments' Certified Final Program Environmental Impact Report for Connect SoCal 2024 recommends the following Project-level air quality mitigation measures: [11]

- Installing high-efficiency or enhanced filtration units, such as Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 or better. Installation of enhanced filtration units can be verified during occupancy inspection prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.
- Disclose potential health impacts to prospective sensitive receptors from living in close proximity to freeways or other sources of air pollution and the reduced effectiveness of air filtration systems when windows are open or residents are outside.
- Identify the responsible implementing and enforcement agency to ensure that enhanced filtration units are installed on-site before a permit of occupancy is issued.
- Identify the responsible entity such as future residents themselves, Homeowner's Association, or property managers for ensuring enhanced filtration units are replaced on time.
- Identify, provide, and disclose ongoing cost-sharing strategies, if any, for replacing the enhanced filtration units.
- Set criteria for assessing progress in installing and replacing the enhanced filtration units,
- Develop a process for evaluating the effectiveness of the enhanced filtration units.
- Diesel generators on site for more than 10 total days shall be equipped with emission control technology verified by EPA or CARB to reduce PM emissions by a minimum of 85%.

[11] "Certified Final Program Environmental Impact Report for Connect SoCal 2024." SCAG, May 2020, *available at:* https://scag.ca.gov/program-environmental-impact-report-0.

- Establish generator sites and truck-staging zones for vehicles waiting to load or unload material on site. Such zones shall be located where diesel emissions have the least impact on abutters, the general public, and especially sensitive receptors such as hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, elderly housing, and convalescent facilities.
- Obtain CARB Portable Equipment Registration with the state or a local district permit for portable engines and portable engine-driven equipment units used at the project work site, with the exception of on-road and off-road motor vehicles. Arrange appropriate consultations with CARB or the local air district to determine registration and permitting requirements prior to equipment operation at the site.
- Provide pedestrian network improvements, such as interconnected street network, narrower roadways and shorter block lengths, sidewalks, parks and public spaces, minimize pedestrian barriers.
- Create urban non-motorized zones.
- Provide bike parking in non-residential and multi-unit residential projects
- Require residential area parking permit.
- Provide ride-sharing programs:
    - Designate a certain percentage of parking spacing for ride sharing vehicles,
    - Designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles,
    - Providing a web site or messaging board for coordinating rides, and
    - Permanent transportation management association membership and finding requirement.

Provided above are several mitigation measures that would reduce Project-related VOC and $PM_{2.5}$/cancer risk emissions. These measures offer a cost-effective, feasible way to incorporate lower-emitting design features into the proposed Project, which subsequently reduces emissions released during Project construction and operation.

A subsequent EIR should be prepared that includes all feasible mitigation measures, as well as an updated air quality analysis to ensure that the necessary mitigation measures are implemented to reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible. The subsequent EIR should also demonstrate a commitment to the implementation of these measures prior to Project approval, to ensure that the Project's potentially significant emissions are reduced to the maximum extent possible.

## Disclaimer

SWAPE has received limited documentation regarding this project. Additional information may become available in the future; thus, we retain the right to revise or amend this report when additional information becomes available. Our professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable environmental consultants practicing in this or similar localities at the time of service. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the scope of work, work methodologies and protocols, site conditions, analytical testing results, and findings presented. This report reflects efforts which were limited to information that was

reasonably accessible at the time of the work, and may contain informational gaps, inconsistencies, or otherwise be incomplete due to the unavailability or uncertainty of information obtained or provided by third parties.

Sincerely,

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.

Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Attachment A: CalEEMod Output Files
Attachment B: Matt Hagemann CV
Attachment C: Paul Rosenfeld CV

# San Francisco Housing Element Detailed Report

## Table of Contents

1. Basic Project Information

1.1. Basic Project Information

1.2. Land Use Types

1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

2. Emissions Summary

2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

2.5. Operations Emissions by Sector, Unmitigated

3. Construction Emissions Details

3.1. Demolition (2026) - Unmitigated

3.3. Site Preparation (2026) - Unmitigated

3.5. Grading (2026) - Unmitigated

3.7. Grading (2027) - Unmitigated

3.9. Building Construction (2027) - Unmitigated

3.11. Building Construction (2028) - Unmitigated

3.13. Building Construction (2029) - Unmitigated

3.15. Building Construction (2030) - Unmitigated

3.17. Building Construction (2031) - Unmitigated

3.19. Building Construction (2032) - Unmitigated

3.21. Building Construction (2033) - Unmitigated

3.23. Paving (2033) - Unmitigated

3.25. Architectural Coating (2033) - Unmitigated

3.27. Architectural Coating (2034) - Unmitigated

4. Operations Emissions Details

4.1. Mobile Emissions by Land Use

4.1.1. Unmitigated

4.2. Energy

4.2.1. Electricity Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

4.2.3. Natural Gas Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

4.3. Area Emissions by Source

4.3.1. Unmitigated

4.4. Water Emissions by Land Use

4.4.1. Unmitigated

4.5. Waste Emissions by Land Use

4.5.1. Unmitigated

4.6. Refrigerant Emissions by Land Use

4.6.1. Unmitigated

4.7. Offroad Emissions By Equipment Type

4.7.1. Unmitigated

4.8. Stationary Emissions By Equipment Type

4.8.1. Unmitigated

4.9. User Defined Emissions By Equipment Type

4.9.1. Unmitigated

4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

5.5. Architectural Coatings

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

5.7. Construction Paving

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

5.9. Operational Mobile Sources

5.9.1. Unmitigated

5.10. Operational Area Sources

5.10.1. Hearths

5.10.2. Architectural Coatings

5.10.3. Landscape Equipment

5.11. Operational Energy Consumption

5.11.1. Unmitigated

5.12. Operational Water and Wastewater Consumption

5.12.1. Unmitigated

5.13. Operational Waste Generation

5.13.1. Unmitigated

5.14. Operational Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment

5.14.1. Unmitigated

5.15. Operational Off-Road Equipment

5.15.1. Unmitigated

5.16. Stationary Sources

5.16.1. Emergency Generators and Fire Pumps

5.16.2. Process Boilers

5.17. User Defined

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

7. Health and Equity Details

7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

7.4. Health & Equity Measures

7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

8. User Changes to Default Data

8.1. Justifications

# 1. Basic Project Information

## 1.1. Basic Project Information

| Data Field | Value |
|---|---|
| Project Name | San Francisco Housing Element |
| Construction Start Date | 1/1/2026 |
| Operational Year | 2050 |
| Lead Agency | — |
| Land Use Scale | Plan/community |
| Analysis Level for Defaults | County |
| Windspeed (m/s) | 3.9 |
| Precipitation (days) | 42 |
| Location | San Francisco, CA, USA |
| County | San Francisco |
| City | San Francisco |
| Air District | Bay Area AQMD |
| Air Basin | San Francisco Bay Area |
| TAZ | 1047 |
| EDFZ | 1 |
| Electric Utility | Pacific Gas & Electric Company |
| Gas Utility | Pacific Gas & Electric |
| App Version | 2022.1.1.32 |

## 1.2. Land Use Types

| Land Use Subtype | Size | Unit | Lot Acreage | Building Area (sq ft) | Landscape Area (sq ft) | Special Landscape Area (sq ft) | Population | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 2,000 | Dwelling Unit | 53 | 1,920,000 | — | — | 4,660 | — |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 2,000 | Dwelling Unit | 31 | 1,920,000 | — | — | 4,660 | — |

## 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

No measures selected

# 2. Emissions Summary

## 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Un/Mit. | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 493 | 493 | 33 | 121 | 0.10 | 1.2 | 27 | 27 | 1.1 | 10 | 11 | — | 39,740 | 39,740 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 105 | 40,504 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 493 | 493 | 35 | 113 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 27 | 27 | 1.0 | 6.5 | 6.9 | — | 38,384 | 38,384 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 39,270 |
| Average Daily (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 148 | 148 | 23 | 76 | 0.07 | 0.74 | 19 | 19 | 0.68 | 4.5 | 4.8 | — | 26,971 | 26,971 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 29 | 27,454 |
| Annual (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 27 | 27 | 4.2 | 14 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.12 | 0.83 | 0.87 | — | 4,465 | 4,465 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 4.8 | 4,545 |

## 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Year | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily - Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 29 | 29 | 0.06 | 1.2 | 20 | 21 | 1.1 | 10 | 11 | — | 6,776 | 6,776 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.62 | 6,799 |
| 2027 | 11 | 8.6 | 33 | 121 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 27 | 27 | 0.39 | 6.5 | 6.9 | — | 39,740 | 39,740 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 105 | 40,504 |
| 2028 | 11 | 8.4 | 31 | 116 | 0.10 | 0.38 | 27 | 27 | 0.36 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 38,945 | 38,945 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 94 | 39,672 |
| 2029 | 11 | 8.1 | 29 | 111 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 27 | 27 | 0.33 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 38,138 | 38,138 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 84 | 38,850 |
| 2030 | 9.5 | 7.8 | 28 | 107 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 27 | 27 | 0.32 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 37,342 | 37,342 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 74 | 38,018 |
| 2031 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 26 | 104 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 27 | 27 | 0.30 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 36,693 | 36,693 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 65 | 37,333 |
| 2032 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 24 | 101 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 27 | 27 | 0.29 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 35,954 | 35,954 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 57 | 36,583 |
| 2033 | 493 | 493 | 5.9 | 16 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.17 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,730 | 4,730 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 7.6 | 4,750 |
| Daily - Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 27 | 28 | 0.06 | 1.1 | 9.4 | 10 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 4.7 | — | 6,766 | 6,766 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 6,791 |
| 2027 | 11 | 8.5 | 35 | 113 | 0.10 | 1.0 | 27 | 27 | 0.96 | 6.5 | 6.9 | — | 38,384 | 38,384 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 39,270 |
| 2028 | 11 | 8.2 | 33 | 108 | 0.10 | 0.38 | 27 | 27 | 0.36 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 37,614 | 37,614 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 38,471 |
| 2029 | 11 | 7.8 | 31 | 104 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 27 | 27 | 0.33 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 36,830 | 36,830 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 37,685 |
| 2030 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 29 | 100 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 27 | 27 | 0.32 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 36,055 | 36,055 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 36,663 |
| 2031 | 9.1 | 7.4 | 27 | 97 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 27 | 27 | 0.30 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 35,418 | 35,418 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 35,996 |
| 2032 | 8.8 | 7.3 | 26 | 93 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 27 | 27 | 0.29 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 34,697 | 34,697 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 35,273 |
| 2033 | 493 | 493 | 25 | 90 | 0.10 | 0.28 | 27 | 27 | 0.27 | 6.5 | 6.8 | — | 34,007 | 34,007 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 34,556 |
| 2034 | 493 | 493 | 1.5 | 14 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.01 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,430 | 4,430 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 4,443 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 18 | 18 | 0.03 | 0.74 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 0.68 | 2.7 | 3.4 | — | 3,709 | 3,709 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 3,723 |
| 2027 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 23 | 66 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 16 | 17 | 0.37 | 4.1 | 4.5 | — | 22,553 | 22,553 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 25 | 23,076 |
| 2028 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 23 | 76 | 0.07 | 0.27 | 19 | 19 | 0.25 | 4.5 | 4.8 | — | 26,971 | 26,971 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 29 | 27,454 |
| 2029 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 22 | 73 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 19 | 19 | 0.24 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 26,337 | 26,337 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 26 | 26,813 |
| 2030 | 6.7 | 5.5 | 20 | 69 | 0.07 | 0.24 | 19 | 19 | 0.23 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 25,782 | 25,782 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 23 | 26,237 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2031 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 19 | 67 | 0.07 | 0.23 | 19 | 19 | 0.22 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 25,327 | 25,327 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 20 | 25,759 |
| 2032 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 19 | 65 | 0.07 | 0.22 | 19 | 19 | 0.20 | 4.5 | 4.7 | — | 24,879 | 24,879 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 17 | 25,307 |
| 2033 | 148 | 148 | 5.0 | 17 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 0.08 | 1.0 | 1.1 | — | 5,689 | 5,689 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 3.4 | 5,760 |
| 2034 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 0.01 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | 0.03 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 26 | 26 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 26 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 2026 | 0.43 | 0.37 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.12 | 0.49 | 0.61 | — | 614 | 614 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 616 |
| 2027 | 1.2 | 0.93 | 4.2 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 0.07 | 0.75 | 0.82 | — | 3,734 | 3,734 | 0.21 | 0.26 | 4.2 | 3,820 |
| 2028 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 14 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.05 | 0.83 | 0.87 | — | 4,465 | 4,465 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 4.8 | 4,545 |
| 2029 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 13 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.87 | — | 4,360 | 4,360 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 4.3 | 4,439 |
| 2030 | 1.2 | 1.00 | 3.7 | 13 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.86 | — | 4,269 | 4,269 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 3.8 | 4,344 |
| 2031 | 1.2 | 0.95 | 3.5 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.86 | — | 4,193 | 4,193 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 3.3 | 4,265 |
| 2032 | 1.1 | 0.94 | 3.4 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.04 | 0.83 | 0.86 | — | 4,119 | 4,119 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 2.9 | 4,190 |
| 2033 | 27 | 27 | 0.91 | 3.1 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.80 | 0.82 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.21 | — | 942 | 942 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.56 | 954 |
| 2034 | 0.53 | 0.53 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.3 | 4.3 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 4.3 |

## 2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Un/Mit. | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 167 | 161 | 70 | 547 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 147,054 | 148,873 | 189 | 3.7 | 35 | 154,742 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 146 | 141 | 71 | 313 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 143,053 | 144,872 | 189 | 4.0 | 28 | 150,827 |
| Average Daily (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 149 | 145 | 31 | 386 | 0.75 | 1.1 | 76 | 77 | 1.1 | 19 | 20 | 1,819 | 90,932 | 92,751 | 188 | 3.7 | 31 | 98,577 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Unmit. | 27 | 27 | 5.7 | 70 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 14 | 14 | 0.20 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 301 | 15,055 | 15,356 | 31 | 0.61 | 5.1 | 16,321 |

## 2.5. Operations Emissions by Sector, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Sector | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 44 | 41 | 19 | 298 | 0.75 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 76,997 | 76,997 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 7.6 | 77,951 |
| Area | 122 | 119 | 42 | 245 | 0.26 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 0.00 | 50,720 | 50,720 | 0.97 | 0.10 | — | 50,774 |
| Energy | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 18,912 | 18,912 | 2.2 | 0.17 | — | 19,019 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Total | 167 | 161 | 70 | 547 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 147,054 | 148,873 | 189 | 3.7 | 35 | 154,742 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 44 | 41 | 23 | 293 | 0.72 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 73,602 | 73,602 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 0.20 | 74,645 |
| Area | 102 | 99 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Energy | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 18,912 | 18,912 | 2.2 | 0.17 | — | 19,019 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Total | 146 | 141 | 71 | 313 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 82 | 86 | 4.2 | 21 | 25 | 1,819 | 143,053 | 144,872 | 189 | 4.0 | 28 | 150,827 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 41 | 38 | 21 | 269 | 0.69 | 0.26 | 76 | 76 | 0.24 | 19 | 20 | — | 70,060 | 70,060 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 71,022 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area | 107 | 107 | 2.0 | 113 | 0.01 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | 0.12 | — | 0.12 | 0.00 | 1,535 | 1,535 | 0.04 | < 0.005 | — | 1,537 |
| Energy | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 18,912 | 18,912 | 2.2 | 0.17 | — | 19,019 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Total | 149 | 145 | 31 | 386 | 0.75 | 1.1 | 76 | 77 | 1.1 | 19 | 20 | 1,819 | 90,932 | 92,751 | 188 | 3.7 | 31 | 98,577 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Mobile | 7.5 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 49 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 14 | 14 | 0.04 | 3.5 | 3.6 | — | 11,599 | 11,599 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 11,759 |
| Area | 20 | 19 | 0.37 | 21 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.00 | 254 | 254 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 255 |
| Energy | 0.19 | 0.09 | 1.6 | 0.69 | 0.01 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | — | 3,131 | 3,131 | 0.37 | 0.03 | — | 3,149 |
| Water | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 37 | 70 | 108 | 3.8 | 0.09 | — | 231 |
| Waste | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 264 | 0.00 | 264 | 26 | 0.00 | — | 923 |
| Refrig. | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Total | 27 | 27 | 5.7 | 70 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 14 | 14 | 0.20 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 301 | 15,055 | 15,356 | 31 | 0.61 | 5.1 | 16,321 |

# 3. Construction Emissions Details

## 3.1. Demolition (2026) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 2.7 | 2.3 | 21 | 19 | 0.03 | 0.84 | — | 0.84 | 0.78 | — | 0.78 | — | 3,427 | 3,427 | 0.14 | 0.03 | — | 3,438 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 2.7 | 2.3 | 21 | 19 | 0.03 | 0.84 | — | 0.84 | 0.78 | — | 0.78 | — | 3,427 | 3,427 | 0.14 | 0.03 | — | 3,438 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.75 | 0.63 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 0.01 | 0.23 | — | 0.23 | 0.21 | — | 0.21 | — | 939 | 939 | 0.04 | 0.01 | — | 942 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.14 | 0.11 | 1.0 | 0.95 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | — | 155 | 155 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 156 |
| Demolition | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 133 | 133 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.46 | 134 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 126 | 126 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 127 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 34 | 34 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.05 | 35 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 5.7 | 5.7 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 5.8 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.3. Site Preparation (2026) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.7 | 3.1 | 29 | 29 | 0.05 | 1.2 | — | 1.2 | 1.1 | — | 1.1 | — | 5,298 | 5,298 | 0.21 | 0.04 | — | 5,316 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 20 | 20 | — | 10 | 10 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.62 | 0.52 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 0.01 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | — | 871 | 871 | 0.04 | 0.01 | — | 874 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 1.7 | 1.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.87 | 0.86 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 144 | 144 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 145 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.59 | 0.59 | — | 0.30 | 0.30 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 155 | 155 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.54 | 156 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 24 | 24 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | 24 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.0 | 4.0 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 4.1 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.5. Grading (2026) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.6 | 3.0 | 27 | 28 | 0.06 | 1.1 | — | 1.1 | 1.0 | — | 1.0 | — | 6,599 | 6,599 | 0.27 | 0.05 | — | 6,621 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 9.2 | 9.2 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.6 | 3.0 | 27 | 28 | 0.06 | 1.1 | — | 1.1 | 1.0 | — | 1.0 | — | 6,599 | 6,599 | 0.27 | 0.05 | — | 6,621 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 9.2 | 9.2 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.99 | 0.83 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 0.02 | 0.31 | — | 0.31 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | — | 1,795 | 1,795 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,801 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2.5 | 2.5 | — | 0.99 | 0.99 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.18 | 0.15 | 1.4 | 1.4 | < 0.005 | 0.06 | — | 0.06 | 0.05 | — | 0.05 | — | 297 | 297 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 298 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.46 | 0.46 | — | 0.18 | 0.18 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 177 | 177 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.62 | 178 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 168 | 168 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 170 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 46 | 46 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.07 | 46 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 7.6 | 7.6 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 7.7 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.7. Grading (2027) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 3.5 | 2.9 | 26 | 27 | 0.06 | 1.0 | — | 1.0 | 0.96 | — | 0.96 | — | 6,598 | 6,598 | 0.27 | 0.05 | — | 6,621 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 9.2 | 9.2 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.54 | 0.46 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 0.01 | 0.16 | — | 0.16 | 0.15 | — | 0.15 | — | 1,020 | 1,020 | 0.04 | 0.01 | — | 1,024 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1.4 | 1.4 | — | 0.56 | 0.56 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.72 | 0.77 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 169 | 169 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 169 |
| Dust From Material Movement | — | — | — | — | — | — | 0.26 | 0.26 | — | 0.10 | 0.10 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 165 | 165 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 167 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 25 | 25 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | 26 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.2 | 4.2 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 4.3 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.9. Building Construction (2027) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 1.0 | 9.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.34 | — | 0.34 | 0.31 | — | 0.31 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 1.0 | 9.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.34 | — | 0.34 | 0.31 | — | 0.31 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.69 | 0.58 | 5.3 | 7.2 | 0.01 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,342 | 1,342 | 0.05 | 0.01 | — | 1,346 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.96 | 1.3 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 222 | 222 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 223 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 8.0 | 7.2 | 5.2 | 94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 25,057 | 25,057 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 80 | 25,204 |
| Vendor | 2.2 | 0.40 | 19 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 12,286 | 12,286 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 25 | 12,895 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 8.0 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,705 | 23,705 | 0.51 | 0.93 | 2.1 | 23,998 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vendor | 2.2 | 0.39 | 20 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 12,282 | 12,282 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 0.65 | 12,866 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13 | 13 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | — | 13,291 | 13,291 | 0.25 | 0.52 | 19 | 13,472 |
| Vendor | 1.2 | 0.22 | 11 | 7.8 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 0.04 | 0.50 | 0.54 | — | 6,875 | 6,875 | 0.93 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 7,208 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.55 | 8.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.55 | — | 2,200 | 2,200 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 3.2 | 2,230 |
| Vendor | 0.22 | 0.04 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.10 | — | 1,138 | 1,138 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 1.0 | 1,193 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.11. Building Construction (2028) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.99 | 8.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.30 | — | 0.30 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,406 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.99 | 8.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.30 | — | 0.30 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,406 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.85 | 0.71 | 6.4 | 9.3 | 0.02 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | — | 1,717 | 1,717 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,723 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.15 | 0.13 | 1.2 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | — | 284 | 284 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 285 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.9 | 7.0 | 4.4 | 90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 24,628 | 24,628 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 72 | 24,767 |
| Vendor | 2.0 | 0.40 | 17 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,919 | 11,919 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 23 | 12,499 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.8 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 81 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,300 | 23,300 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 1.9 | 23,591 |
| Vendor | 2.0 | 0.38 | 18 | 14 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,916 | 11,916 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.58 | 12,475 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 16,718 | 16,718 | 0.32 | 0.14 | 22 | 16,789 |
| Vendor | 1.4 | 0.28 | 13 | 9.7 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 8,536 | 8,536 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 7.0 | 8,943 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.70 | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,768 | 2,768 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 3.7 | 2,780 |
| Vendor | 0.26 | 0.05 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,413 | 1,413 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 1.2 | 1,481 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.13. Building Construction (2029) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.97 | 8.6 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | 0.25 | — | 0.25 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.2 | 0.97 | 8.6 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.28 | — | 0.28 | 0.25 | — | 0.25 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.82 | 0.69 | 6.1 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | 0.18 | — | 0.18 | — | 1,712 | 1,712 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,718 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.15 | 0.13 | 1.1 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | — | 0.04 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 283 | 283 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 284 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.6 | 6.8 | 4.4 | 85 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 24,223 | 24,223 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 64 | 24,352 |
| Vendor | 1.9 | 0.32 | 16 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,518 | 11,518 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 20 | 12,093 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 7.6 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,917 | 22,917 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 1.7 | 23,208 |
| Vendor | 1.9 | 0.30 | 17 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,517 | 11,517 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.51 | 12,073 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 5.3 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 16,398 | 16,398 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 20 | 16,465 |
| Vendor | 1.4 | 0.21 | 12 | 9.4 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 8,227 | 8,227 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 6.1 | 8,630 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0.69 | 9.9 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,715 | 2,715 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 3.3 | 2,726 |
| Vendor | 0.25 | 0.04 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,362 | 1,362 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 1.0 | 1,429 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.15. Building Construction (2030) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.94 | 8.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.26 | — | 0.26 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.94 | 8.4 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.26 | — | 0.26 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.80 | 0.67 | 6.0 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,712 | 1,712 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,718 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.15 | 0.12 | 1.1 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 283 | 283 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 284 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.6 | 6.5 | 4.3 | 82 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,839 | 23,839 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 57 | 23,961 |
| Vendor | 1.7 | 0.31 | 15 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,106 | 11,106 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 17 | 11,653 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.6 | 6.5 | 5.4 | 74 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,553 | 22,553 | 0.44 | 0.19 | 1.5 | 22,622 |
| Vendor | 1.7 | 0.30 | 16 | 13 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 11,105 | 11,105 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.45 | 11,636 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.7 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 16,138 | 16,138 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 18 | 16,203 |
| Vendor | 1.2 | 0.21 | 11 | 9.1 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 7,932 | 7,932 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 5.4 | 8,316 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.59 | 9.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,672 | 2,672 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 2.9 | 2,683 |
| Vendor | 0.23 | 0.04 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,313 | 1,313 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.89 | 1,377 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.17. Building Construction (2031) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.92 | 8.1 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.92 | 8.1 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.24 | — | 0.24 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.78 | 0.66 | 5.8 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | 0.16 | — | 0.16 | — | 1,712 | 1,712 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,718 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.14 | 0.12 | 1.1 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 283 | 283 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 284 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker | 6.5 | 6.3 | 3.5 | 79 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,605 | 23,605 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 50 | 23,720 |
| Vendor | 1.6 | 0.31 | 14 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,691 | 10,691 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 15 | 11,208 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.3 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,330 | 22,330 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 1.3 | 22,397 |
| Vendor | 1.6 | 0.30 | 15 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,692 | 10,692 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.39 | 11,194 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.5 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 15,978 | 15,978 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 15 | 16,041 |
| Vendor | 1.2 | 0.21 | 10 | 8.8 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 7,637 | 7,637 | 0.89 | 1.1 | 4.6 | 8,000 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.58 | 9.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,645 | 2,645 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 2.6 | 2,656 |
| Vendor | 0.21 | 0.04 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,264 | 1,264 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.76 | 1,324 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.19. Building Construction (2032) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.90 | 7.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | 0.21 | — | 0.21 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.1 | 0.90 | 7.9 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.22 | — | 0.22 | 0.21 | — | 0.21 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.77 | 0.64 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.16 | — | 0.16 | 0.15 | — | 0.15 | — | 1,717 | 1,717 | 0.07 | 0.01 | — | 1,723 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.14 | 0.12 | 1.0 | 1.7 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 0.03 | — | 284 | 284 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 285 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.3 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 23,278 | 23,278 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 44 | 23,387 |
| Vendor | 1.5 | 0.31 | 13 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,279 | 10,279 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 13 | 10,791 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker | 6.3 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 22,020 | 22,020 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 1.1 | 22,087 |
| Vendor | 1.5 | 0.30 | 14 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 10,280 | 10,280 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.33 | 10,780 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 4.4 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 3.9 | 3.9 | — | 15,800 | 15,800 | 0.23 | 0.14 | 14 | 15,860 |
| Vendor | 1.1 | 0.21 | 9.7 | 8.5 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.70 | — | 7,363 | 7,363 | 0.83 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 7,725 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.58 | 8.7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | — | 2,616 | 2,616 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 2.2 | 2,626 |
| Vendor | 0.19 | 0.04 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | — | 1,219 | 1,219 | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.65 | 1,279 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.21. Building Construction (2033) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 1.0 | 0.88 | 7.7 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.20 | — | 0.20 | 0.19 | — | 0.19 | — | 2,397 | 2,397 | 0.10 | 0.02 | — | 2,405 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Off-Road | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.87 | 1.5 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | — | 272 | 272 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 273 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.26 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 45 | 45 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 45 |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 6.1 | 5.9 | 4.4 | 66 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24 | 24 | 0.00 | 5.6 | 5.6 | — | 21,738 | 21,738 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.99 | 21,805 |
| Vendor | 1.4 | 0.30 | 13 | 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.99 | — | 9,872 | 9,872 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.28 | 10,347 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.41 | 7.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.62 | — | 2,472 | 2,472 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 1.9 | 2,481 |
| Vendor | 0.16 | 0.03 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.11 | — | 1,120 | 1,120 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.52 | 1,175 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 1.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | — | 409 | 409 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | 0.31 | 411 |
| Vendor | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.24 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.06 | 0.06 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 185 | 185 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 194 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.23. Paving (2033) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.70 | 0.59 | 5.9 | 9.8 | 0.01 | 0.18 | — | 0.18 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,511 | 1,511 | 0.06 | 0.01 | — | 1,516 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.70 | 0.59 | 5.9 | 9.8 | 0.01 | 0.18 | — | 0.18 | 0.17 | — | 0.17 | — | 1,511 | 1,511 | 0.06 | 0.01 | — | 1,516 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.21 | 0.18 | 1.8 | 3.0 | < 0.005 | 0.06 | — | 0.06 | 0.05 | — | 0.05 | — | 455 | 455 | 0.02 | < 0.005 | — | 457 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.54 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 75 | 75 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 76 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 120 | 120 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.20 | 120 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | — | 113 | 113 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 114 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 34 | 34 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.03 | 34 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 5.7 | 5.7 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 5.7 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.25. Architectural Coating (2033) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.76 | 1.1 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 134 | 134 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 134 |
| Architectural Coatings | 492 | 492 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.76 | 1.1 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 134 | 134 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 134 |
| Architectural Coatings | 492 | 492 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.33 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 40 | 40 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 40 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architectural Coating | 146 | 146 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.01 | < 0.005 | 0.04 | 0.06 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 6.6 | 6.6 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 6.6 |
| Architectural Coatings | 27 | 27 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.69 | 15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,596 | 4,596 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 7.6 | 4,616 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.89 | 13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,348 | 4,348 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 4,361 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 3.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 | — | 1,296 | 1,296 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.98 | 1,300 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | — | 214 | 214 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.16 | 215 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## 3.27. Architectural Coating (2034) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Location | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.76 | 1.1 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 134 | 134 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 134 |
| Architectural Coatings | 492 | 492 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 0.78 | 0.78 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 0.79 |
| Architectural Coatings | 2.9 | 2.9 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Off-Road Equipment | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | < 0.005 | — | 0.13 | 0.13 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 0.13 |
| Architectural Coatings | 0.53 | 0.53 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Onsite truck | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Offsite | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.74 | 13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.1 | — | 4,296 | 4,296 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 4,309 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average Daily | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | 0.01 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 25 | 25 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | 25 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Worker | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 0.00 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 4.2 | 4.2 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | 4.2 |
| Vendor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Hauling | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

# 4. Operations Emissions Details

## 4.1. Mobile Emissions by Land Use

### 4.1.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 22 | 20 | 9.7 | 149 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 38,498 | 38,498 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 38,975 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 22 | 20 | 9.7 | 149 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 38,498 | 38,498 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 38,975 |
| Total | 44 | 41 | 19 | 298 | 0.75 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 76,997 | 76,997 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 7.6 | 77,951 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 22 | 20 | 11 | 146 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 36,801 | 36,801 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.10 | 37,323 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 22 | 20 | 11 | 146 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 41 | 41 | 0.13 | 10 | 11 | — | 36,801 | 36,801 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.10 | 37,323 |
| Total | 44 | 41 | 23 | 293 | 0.72 | 0.27 | 82 | 82 | 0.25 | 21 | 21 | — | 73,602 | 73,602 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 0.20 | 74,645 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.02 | 1.8 | 1.8 | — | 5,800 | 5,800 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 5,879 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.02 | 1.8 | 1.8 | — | 5,800 | 5,800 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 5,879 |
| Total | 7.5 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 49 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 14 | 14 | 0.04 | 3.5 | 3.6 | — | 11,599 | 11,599 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 11,759 |

## 4.2. Energy

### 4.2.1. Electricity Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 7,626 | 7,626 | 1.2 | 0.15 | — | 7,701 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,813 | 3,813 | 0.62 | 0.07 | — | 3,851 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 7,626 | 7,626 | 1.2 | 0.15 | — | 7,701 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 631 | 631 | 0.10 | 0.01 | — | 638 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 631 | 631 | 0.10 | 0.01 | — | 638 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,263 | 1,263 | 0.20 | 0.02 | — | 1,275 |

## 4.2.3. Natural Gas Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Total | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 11,286 | 11,286 | 1.00 | 0.02 | — | 11,318 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 0.52 | 0.26 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.03 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | 0.36 | — | 0.36 | — | 5,643 | 5,643 | 0.50 | 0.01 | — | 5,659 |
| Total | 1.0 | 0.52 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 0.06 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | 0.72 | — | 0.72 | — | 11,286 | 11,286 | 1.00 | 0.02 | — | 11,318 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.81 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | — | 934 | 934 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | — | 937 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.81 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | 0.07 | — | 0.07 | — | 934 | 934 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | — | 937 |
| Total | 0.19 | 0.09 | 1.6 | 0.69 | 0.01 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | 0.13 | — | 0.13 | — | 1,869 | 1,869 | 0.17 | < 0.005 | — | 1,874 |

## 4.3. Area Emissions by Source

### 4.3.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Source | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hearths | 4.6 | 2.3 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Consumer Products | 82 | 82 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architectural Coating | 15 | 15 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Landscape Equipment | 21 | 20 | 2.1 | 228 | 0.01 | 0.10 | — | 0.10 | 0.08 | — | 0.08 | — | 607 | 607 | 0.03 | 0.01 | — | 609 |
| Total | 122 | 119 | 42 | 245 | 0.26 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 3.3 | — | 3.3 | 0.00 | 50,720 | 50,720 | 0.97 | 0.10 | — | 50,774 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hearths | 4.6 | 2.3 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Consumer Products | 82 | 82 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Architectural Coatings | 15 | 15 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | 102 | 99 | 39 | 17 | 0.25 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 3.2 | — | 3.2 | 0.00 | 50,113 | 50,113 | 0.94 | 0.09 | — | 50,165 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hearths | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.08 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.00 | 205 | 205 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 205 |
| Consumer Products | 15 | 15 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Architectural Coatings | 2.7 | 2.7 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Landscape Equipment | 1.9 | 1.8 | 0.19 | 21 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | 0.01 | — | 0.01 | — | 50 | 50 | < 0.005 | < 0.005 | — | 50 |
| Total | 20 | 19 | 0.37 | 21 | < 0.005 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.02 | — | 0.02 | 0.00 | 254 | 254 | 0.01 | < 0.005 | — | 255 |

## 4.4. Water Emissions by Land Use

### 4.4.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 112 | 212 | 325 | 12 | 0.28 | — | 697 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 225 | 425 | 650 | 23 | 0.56 | — | 1,394 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 19 | 35 | 54 | 1.9 | 0.05 | — | 115 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 19 | 35 | 54 | 1.9 | 0.05 | — | 115 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 37 | 70 | 108 | 3.8 | 0.09 | — | 231 |

## 4.5. Waste Emissions by Land Use

### 4.5.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 797 | 0.00 | 797 | 80 | 0.00 | — | 2,789 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1,594 | 0.00 | 1,594 | 159 | 0.00 | — | 5,577 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 132 | 0.00 | 132 | 13 | 0.00 | — | 462 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 132 | 0.00 | 132 | 13 | 0.00 | — | 462 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 264 | 0.00 | 264 | 26 | 0.00 | — | 923 |

## 4.6. Refrigerant Emissions by Land Use

### 4.6.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/T High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 28 | 28 |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Apartments Mid Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 4.6 | 4.6 |

## 4.7. Offroad Emissions By Equipment Type

### 4.7.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Equipment Type | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.8. Stationary Emissions By Equipment Type

### 4.8.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Equipment Type | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.9. User Defined Emissions By Equipment Type

### 4.9.1. Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Equipment Type | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

### 4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Vegetation | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

### 4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Land Use | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

## 4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Species | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Avoided | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Sequestered | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Removed | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Avoided | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Sequestered | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Removed | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Annual | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Avoided | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Sequestered | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Removed | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Subtotal | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

# 5. Activity Data

## 5.1. Construction Schedule

| Phase Name | Phase Type | Start Date | End Date | Days Per Week | Work Days per Phase | Phase Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | Demolition | 1/1/2026 | 5/21/2026 | 5.0 | 100 | — |
| Site Preparation | Site Preparation | 5/22/2026 | 8/14/2026 | 5.0 | 60 | — |
| Grading | Grading | 8/15/2026 | 3/20/2027 | 5.0 | 155 | — |
| Building Construction | Building Construction | 3/21/2027 | 2/27/2033 | 5.0 | 1,550 | — |
| Paving | Paving | 2/28/2033 | 8/1/2033 | 5.0 | 110 | — |
| Architectural Coating | Architectural Coating | 8/2/2033 | 1/3/2034 | 5.0 | 110 | — |

## 5.2. Off-Road Equipment

### 5.2.1. Unmitigated

| Phase Name | Equipment Type | Fuel Type | Engine Tier | Number per Day | Hours Per Day | Horsepower | Load Factor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | Rubber Tired Dozers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 367 | 0.40 |
| Demolition | Excavators | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 8.0 | 36 | 0.38 |
| Demolition | Concrete/Industrial Saws | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 33 | 0.73 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site Preparation | Rubber Tired Dozers | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 8.0 | 367 | 0.40 |
| Site Preparation | Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes | Diesel | Average | 4.0 | 8.0 | 84 | 0.37 |
| Grading | Graders | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 148 | 0.41 |
| Grading | Excavators | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 36 | 0.38 |
| Grading | Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 84 | 0.37 |
| Grading | Scrapers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 423 | 0.48 |
| Grading | Rubber Tired Dozers | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 367 | 0.40 |
| Building Construction | Forklifts | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 8.0 | 82 | 0.20 |
| Building Construction | Generator Sets | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 14 | 0.74 |
| Building Construction | Cranes | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 7.0 | 367 | 0.29 |
| Building Construction | Welders | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 8.0 | 46 | 0.45 |
| Building Construction | Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes | Diesel | Average | 3.0 | 7.0 | 84 | 0.37 |
| Paving | Pavers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 81 | 0.42 |
| Paving | Paving Equipment | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 89 | 0.36 |
| Paving | Rollers | Diesel | Average | 2.0 | 8.0 | 36 | 0.38 |
| Architectural Coating | Air Compressors | Diesel | Average | 1.00 | 6.0 | 37 | 0.48 |

## 5.3. Construction Vehicles

### 5.3.1. Unmitigated

| Phase Name | Trip Type | One-Way Trips per Day | Miles per Trip | Vehicle Mix |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | Worker | 15 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Demolition | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Demolition | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Demolition | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Site Preparation | Worker | 18 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site Preparation | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Site Preparation | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Site Preparation | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Grading | Worker | 20 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Grading | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Grading | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Grading | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Building Construction | Worker | 2,880 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Building Construction | Vendor | 428 | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Building Construction | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Building Construction | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Paving | Worker | 15 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Paving | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Paving | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Paving | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |
| Architectural Coating | Worker | 576 | 12 | LDA,LDT1,LDT2 |
| Architectural Coating | Vendor | — | 8.4 | HHDT,MHDT |
| Architectural Coating | Hauling | 0.00 | 20 | HHDT |
| Architectural Coating | Onsite truck | — | — | HHDT |

## 5.4. Vehicles

### 5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

## 5.5. Architectural Coatings

| Phase Name | Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Parking Area Coated (sq ft) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architectural Coating | 7,776,000 | 2,592,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — |

## 5.6. Dust Mitigation

### 5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

| Phase Name | Material Imported (cy) | Material Exported (cy) | Acres Graded (acres) | Material Demolished (sq. ft.) | Acres Paved (acres) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demolition | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — | 0.00 |
| Site Preparation | — | — | 90 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Grading | — | — | 465 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Paving | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

### 5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

## 5.7. Construction Paving

| Phase Name | Land Use | Area Paved (acres) | % Asphalt |
|---|---|---|---|
| Paving | Apartments Mid Rise | — | 0% |
| Paving | Condo/Townhouse High Rise | — | 0% |

## 5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

### kWh per Year and Emission Factor (lb/MWh)

| Year | kWh per Year | CO2 | CH4 | N2O |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2026 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2027 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2028 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2029 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2030 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2031 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2032 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |
| 2033 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2034 | 0.00 | 204 | 0.03 | < 0.005 |

## 5.9. Operational Mobile Sources

### 5.9.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use Type | Trips/Weekday | Trips/Saturday | Trips/Sunday | Trips/Year | VMT/Weekday | VMT/Saturday | VMT/Sunday | VMT/Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 10,880 | 9,820 | 8,180 | 3,775,143 | 57,891 | 52,251 | 43,525 | 20,087,074 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 10,880 | 9,820 | 8,180 | 3,775,143 | 57,891 | 52,251 | 43,525 | 20,087,074 |

## 5.10. Operational Area Sources

### 5.10.1. Hearths

| Land Use | Hearth Type | Unmitigated (number) | Mitigated (number) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | Wood Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Gas Fireplaces | 1,020 | 1,020 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Propane Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Electric Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | No Fireplaces | 980 | 980 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Conventional Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Non-Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Pellet Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Wood Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Gas Fireplaces | 1,020 | 1,020 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Propane Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Electric Fireplaces | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | No Fireplaces | 980 | 980 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Conventional Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Non-Catalytic Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Pellet Wood Stoves | 0 | 0 |

### 5.10.2. Architectural Coatings

| — | Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft) | Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft) | Parking Area Coated (sq ft) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| undefined | 7,776,000 | 2,592,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | — |

### 5.10.3. Landscape Equipment

| Season | Unit | Value |
|---|---|---|
| Snow Days | day/yr | 0.00 |
| Summer Days | day/yr | 180 |

## 5.11. Operational Energy Consumption

### 5.11.1. Unmitigated

Electricity (kWh/yr) and CO2 and CH4 and N2O and Natural Gas (kBTU/yr)

| Land Use | Electricity (kWh/yr) | CO2 | CH4 | N2O | Natural Gas (kBTU/yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 6,822,902 | 204 | 0.0330 | 0.0040 | 17,608,142 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 6,822,902 | 204 | 0.0330 | 0.0040 | 17,608,142 |

## 5.12. Operational Water and Wastewater Consumption

### 5.12.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use | Indoor Water (gal/year) | Outdoor Water (gal/year) |
|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 58,681,050 | 0.00 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 58,681,050 | 0.00 |

## 5.13. Operational Waste Generation

### 5.13.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use | Waste (ton/year) | Cogeneration (kWh/year) |
|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | 1,479 | 0.00 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | 1,479 | 0.00 |

## 5.14. Operational Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment

### 5.14.1. Unmitigated

| Land Use | Equipment Type | Refrigerant | GWP | Quantity (kg) | Operations Leak Rate | Service Leak Rate | Times Serviced |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apartments Mid Rise | Average room A/C & Other residential A/C and heat pumps | R-410A | 2,088 | < 0.005 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 10.0 |
| Apartments Mid Rise | Household refrigerators and/or freezers | R-134a | 1,430 | 0.12 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Average room A/C & Other residential A/C and heat pumps | R-410A | 2,088 | < 0.005 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 10.0 |
| Condo/Townhouse High Rise | Household refrigerators and/or freezers | R-134a | 1,430 | 0.12 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

## 5.15. Operational Off-Road Equipment

### 5.15.1. Unmitigated

## 5.16. Stationary Sources

### 5.16.1. Emergency Generators and Fire Pumps

### 5.16.2. Process Boilers

## 5.17. User Defined

## 5.18. Vegetation

### 5.18.1. Land Use Change

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

| Vegetation Land Use Type | Vegetation Soil Type | Initial Acres | Final Acres |
|---|---|---|---|

### 5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

| Biomass Cover Type | Initial Acres | Final Acres |
|---|---|---|

### 5.18.2. Sequestration

#### 5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

| Tree Type | Number | Electricity Saved (kWh/year) | Natural Gas Saved (btu/year) |
|---|---|---|---|

# 6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

## 6.1. Climate Risk Summary

Cal-Adapt midcentury 2040–2059 average projections for four hazards are reported below for your project location. These are under Representation Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 which assumes GHG emissions will continue to rise strongly through 2050 and then plateau around 2100.

| Climate Hazard | Result for Project Location | Unit |
|---|---|---|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | 5.9 | annual days of extreme heat |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extreme Precipitation | 7.5 | annual days with precipitation above 20 mm |
| Sea Level Rise | — | meters of inundation depth |
| Wildfire | 4.4 | annual hectares burned |

Temperature and Extreme Heat data are for grid cell in which your project are located. The projection is based on the 98th historical percentile of daily maximum/minimum temperatures from observed historical data (32 climate model ensemble from Cal-Adapt, 2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.
Extreme Precipitation data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The threshold of 20 mm is equivalent to about ¾ an inch of rain, which would be light to moderate rainfall if received over a full day or heavy rain if received over a period of 2 to 4 hours. Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.
Sea Level Rise data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from Radke et al. (2017), as reported in Cal-Adapt (Radke et al., 2017, CEC-500-2017-008), and consider inundation location and depth for the San Francisco Bay, the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and California coast resulting different increments of sea level rise coupled with extreme storm events. Users may select from four scenarios to view the range in potential inundation depth for the grid cell. The four scenarios are: No rise, 0.5 meter, 1.0 meter, 1.41 meters
Wildfire data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from UC Davis, as reported in Cal-Adapt (2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5), and consider historical data of climate, vegetation, population density, and large (> 400 ha) fire history. Users may select from four model simulations to view the range in potential wildfire probabilities for the grid cell. The four simulations make different assumptions about expected rainfall and temperature are: Warmer/drier (HadGEM2-ES), Cooler/wetter (CNRM-CM5), Average conditions (CanESM2), Range of different rainfall and temperature possibilities (MIROC5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

## 6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

| Climate Hazard | Exposure Score | Sensitivity Score | Adaptive Capacity Score | Vulnerability Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Extreme Precipitation | 2 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Sea Level Rise | 1 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Wildfire | 1 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Flooding | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Drought | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Snowpack Reduction | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Air Quality Degradation | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.
The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.
The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores do not include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

## 6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

| Climate Hazard | Exposure Score | Sensitivity Score | Adaptive Capacity Score | Vulnerability Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Extreme Precipitation | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Sea Level Rise | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Wildfire | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Flooding | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Drought | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Snowpack Reduction | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Air Quality Degradation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.
The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.
The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

## 6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

# 7. Health and Equity Details

## 7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

| Indicator | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---|
| Exposure Indicators | — |
| AQ-Ozone | 3.1 |
| AQ-PM | 25 |
| AQ-DPM | 99 |
| Drinking Water | 15 |
| Lead Risk Housing | 59 |
| Pesticides | 9.0 |
| Toxic Releases | 45 |
| Traffic | 53 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Effect Indicators | — |
| CleanUp Sites | 74 |
| Groundwater | 71 |
| Haz Waste Facilities/Generators | 98 |
| Impaired Water Bodies | 0.00 |
| Solid Waste | 80 |
| Sensitive Population | — |
| Asthma | 81 |
| Cardio-vascular | 18 |
| Low Birth Weights | 84 |
| Socioeconomic Factor Indicators | — |
| Education | 48 |
| Housing | 67 |
| Linguistic | 82 |
| Poverty | 65 |
| Unemployment | 54 |

## 7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

| Indicator | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---|
| Economic | — |
| Above Poverty | 21.28833569 |
| Employed | 26.07468241 |
| Median HI | 16.37366868 |
| Education | — |
| Bachelor's or higher | 64.48094444 |
| High school enrollment | 100 |
| Preschool enrollment | 38.90671115 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Transportation | — |
| Auto Access | 0.372128834 |
| Active commuting | 99.53804697 |
| Social | — |
| 2-parent households | 2.643397921 |
| Voting | 31.75927114 |
| Neighborhood | — |
| Alcohol availability | 4.516874118 |
| Park access | 38.62440652 |
| Retail density | 99.05042987 |
| Supermarket access | 94.25125112 |
| Tree canopy | 6.03105351 |
| Housing | — |
| Homeownership | 10.15013474 |
| Housing habitability | 0.526113178 |
| Low-inc homeowner severe housing cost burden | 32.54202489 |
| Low-inc renter severe housing cost burden | 44.3731554 |
| Uncrowded housing | 36.46862569 |
| Health Outcomes | — |
| Insured adults | 41.04965995 |
| Arthritis | 59.3 |
| Asthma ER Admissions | 18.9 |
| High Blood Pressure | 44.4 |
| Cancer (excluding skin) | 68.9 |
| Asthma | 37.3 |
| Coronary Heart Disease | 43.7 |
| Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease | 33.2 |
| Diagnosed Diabetes | 36.9 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Life Expectancy at Birth | 23.5 |
| Cognitively Disabled | 4.4 |
| Physically  Disabled | 1.7 |
| Heart Attack ER Admissions | 60.2 |
| Mental Health Not Good | 34.8 |
| Chronic Kidney Disease | 35.4 |
| Obesity | 39.8 |
| Pedestrian Injuries | 98.0 |
| Physical Health Not Good | 33.1 |
| Stroke | 34.3 |
| Health Risk Behaviors | — |
| Binge Drinking | 24.0 |
| Current Smoker | 20.2 |
| No Leisure Time for Physical Activity | 36.8 |
| Climate Change Exposures | — |
| Wildfire Risk | 0.0 |
| SLR Inundation Area | 0.0 |
| Children | 86.0 |
| Elderly | 54.5 |
| English Speaking | 11.2 |
| Foreign-born | 81.4 |
| Outdoor Workers | 88.7 |
| Climate Change Adaptive Capacity | — |
| Impervious Surface Cover | 0.2 |
| Traffic Density | 58.5 |
| Traffic Access | 87.4 |
| Other Indices | — |
| Hardship | 58.6 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Other Decision Support | — |
| 2016 Voting | 44.8 |

## 7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

| Metric | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---|
| CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score for Project Location (a) | 71 |
| Healthy Places Index Score for Project Location (b) | 20 |
| Project Located in a Designated Disadvantaged Community (Senate Bill 535) | No |
| Project Located in a Low-Income Community (Assembly Bill 1550) | Yes |
| Project Located in a Community Air Protection Program Community (Assembly Bill 617) | No |

a: The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.
b: The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

## 7.4. Health & Equity Measures

No Health & Equity Measures selected.

## 7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

Health & Equity Evaluation Scorecard not completed.

## 7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

No Health & Equity Custom Measures created.

# 8. User Changes to Default Data

## 8.1. Justifications

| Screen | Justification |
|---|---|
| Operations: Water and Waste Water | Outdoor water use set to zero. |

SWAPE Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

## Matthew F. Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.

- **Geologic and Hydrogeologic Characterization, Investigation and Remediation Strategies**
- **Industrial Stormwater Compliance**
- **CEQA Review**
- **Expert Testimony**

**Professional Certifications:**
California Professional Geologist, P.G.
California Certified Hydrogeologist, C.Hg.

**Education:**
M.S. Degree, Geology, California State University Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 1984.
B.A. Degree, Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA, 1982.

**Professional Experience:**
30 years of experience in environmental policy, contaminant assessment and remediation, stormwater compliance, and CEQA review. Spent nine years with the U.S. EPA in the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) and Superfund programs and served as EPA's Senior Science Policy Advisor in the Western Regional Office where I identified emerging threats to groundwater. While with EPA, I served as a Senior Hydrogeologist in the oversight of the assessment of seven major military facilities undergoing base closure. Led numerous enforcement actions under provisions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and directed efforts to improve hydrogeologic characterization and water quality monitoring. For the past 15 years, as a founding partner with SWAPE, I developed extensive client relationships and has managed complex projects that include consultations as an expert witness and a regulatory specialist, and managing projects ranging from industrial stormwater compliance to CEQA review of impacts from hazardous waste, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Positions held include:

Government:
Senior Science Policy Advisor and Hydrogeologist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1989–1998);

Hydrogeologist, National Park Service, Water Resources Division (1998 – 2000);
Geologist, U.S. Forest Service (1986 – 1998).

Educational:
Geology Instructor, Golden West College, 2010 – 2104, 2017;
Adjunct Faculty Member, San Francisco State University, Department of Geosciences (1993 – 1998);
Instructor, College of Marin, Department of Science (1990 – 1995).

Private Sector:
Founding Partner, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) (2003 – present);
Senior Environmental Analyst, Komex H2O Science, Inc. (2000 -- 2003);
Executive Director, Orange Coast Watch (2001 – 2004);
Geologist, Dames & Moore (1984 – 1986).

**Senior Regulatory and Litigation Support Analyst:**
With SWAPE, responsibilities have included:

- Lead analyst and testifying expert, for both plaintiffs and defendants, in the review of over 300 environmental impact reports and negative declarations since 2003 under CEQA that identify significant issues with regard to hazardous waste, water resources, water quality, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and geologic hazards.
- Recommending additional mitigation measures to lead agencies at the local and county level to include additional characterization of health risks and implementation of protective measures to reduce exposure to hazards from toxins.
- Stormwater analysis, sampling and best management practice evaluation, for both government agencies and corporate clients, at more than 150 industrial facilities.
- Serving as expert witness for both plaintiffs and defendants in cases including contamination of groundwater, CERCLAcompliance in assessment and remediation, and industrial stormwater contamination.
- Technical assistance and litigation support for vapor intrusion concerns, for both government agencies and corporate clients.
- Lead analyst and testifying expert in the review of environmental issues in license applicationsfor large solar power plants before the California Energy Commission.
- Manager of a project to evaluate numerous formerly used military sites in the western U.S.
- Manager of a comprehensive evaluation of potential sources of perchlorate contamination in Southern California drinking water wells.
- Manager and designated expert for litigation support under provisions of Proposition 65 in the review of releases of gasoline to sources drinking water at major refineries and hundreds of gas stations throughout California.

With Komex H2O Science Inc., duties included the following:

- Senior author of a report on the extent of perchlorate contamination that was used in testimony by the former U.S. EPA Administrator and General Counsel.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of MTBE use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of perchlorate use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in a study that estimates nationwide costs for MTBE remediation and drinking

water treatment, results of which were published in newspapers nationwide and in testimony against provisions of an energy bill that would limit liability for oil companies.

- Research to support litigation to restore drinking water supplies that have been contaminated by MTBE in California and New York.
- Lead author for a multi-volume remedial investigation report for an operating school in LosAngeles that met strict Sate of California regulatory requirements.
- Development of strategic approaches for cleanup of contaminated sites in consultation withclients and regulators.

**Hydrogeology:**

As a Senior Hydrogeologist with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, led investigations to characterize and cleanup closing military bases, including Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, Treasure Island Naval Station, Alameda Naval Station, Moffett Field, Mather Army Airfield, and Sacramento Army Depot. Specific activities included:

- Leading efforts to model groundwater flow and contaminant transport, ensured adequacy of monitoring networks, and assessed cleanup alternatives for contaminated sediment, soil, and groundwater.
- Initiating a regional program for evaluation of groundwater sampling practices and laboratory analysis at military bases.
- Identifying emerging issues, wrote technical guidance, and assisted in policy and regulation development through work on four national U.S. EPA workgroups, including the Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum and the Federal Facilities Forum.

At the request of the State of Hawaii, developed a methodology to determine the vulnerability of groundwater to contamination on the islands of Maui and Oahu. Used analytical models and a GIS to show zones of vulnerability, and the results were adopted and published by the State of Hawaii and County of Maui.

As a hydrogeologist with the EPA Groundwater Protection Section, worked with provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act and NEPA to prevent drinking water contamination. Specific activities included the following:

- Received an EPA Bronze Medal for contribution to the development of national guidance for the protection of drinking water.
- Managed the Sole Source Aquifer Program and protected the drinking water of two communities through designation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Prepared geologic reports, conducted hearings, and responded to public comments from residents who were very concerned about the impact of designation.
- Reviewed a number of Environmental Impact Statements for planned major developments, including large hazardous and solid waste disposal facilities, mine reclamation, and water transfer.

Served as a hydrogeologist with the RCRA Hazardous Waste program. Duties included:

- Supervised the hydrogeologic investigation of hazardous waste sites to determine compliancewith Subtitle C requirements.
- Reviewed and wrote "part B" permits for the disposal of hazardous waste.
- Conducted RCRA Corrective Action investigations of waste sites and led inspections that formed the basis for significant enforcement actions that were developed in close coordination with U.S.EPA legal counsel.

- Wrote contract specifications and supervised contractor's investigations of waste sites.

With the National Park Service, directed service-wide investigations of contaminant sources to prevent degradation of water quality, including the following:

- Applied pertinent laws and regulations including CERCLA, RCRA, NEPA, NRDA, and the Clean Water Act to control military, mining, and landfill contaminants.
- Conducted watershed-scale investigations of contaminants at parks, including Yellowstone and Olympic National Park.
- Identified high-levels of perchlorate in soil adjacent to a national park in New Mexicoand advised park superintendent on appropriate response actions under CERCLA.
- Served as a Park Service representative on the Interagency Perchlorate Steering Committee, a national workgroup.
- Developed a program to conduct environmental compliance audits of all National Parks while serving on a national workgroup.
- Co-authored two papers on the potential for water contamination from the operation of personal watercraft and snowmobiles, these papers serving as the basis for the development of nation- wide policy on the use of these vehicles in National Parks.
- Contributed to the Federal Multi-Agency Source Water Agreement under the Clean Water Action Plan.

**Policy:**

Served as senior management as the Senior Science Policy Advisor with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9. Activities included the following:

- Advising the Regional Administrator and senior management on emerging issues such as the potential for the gasoline additive MTBE and ammonium perchlorate to contaminate drinkingwater supplies.
- Shaping EPA's national response to these threats by serving on workgroups and by contributingto guidance, including the Office of Research and Development publication, Oxygenates in Water: Critical Information and Research Needs.
- Improving the technical training of EPA's scientific and engineering staff.
- Earning an EPA Bronze Medal for representing the region's 300 scientists and engineers in negotiations with the Administrator and senior management to better integrate scientific principles into the policy-making process.
- Establishing national protocol for the peer review of scientific documents.

**Geology:**

With the U.S. Forest Service, led investigations to determine hillslope stability of areas proposed for timber harvest in the central Oregon Coast Range. Specific activities included:

- Mapping geology in the field, and used aerial photographic interpretation and mathematical models to determine slope stability.
- Coordinating research with community stakeholders who were concerned with natural resource protection.
- Characterizing the geology of an aquifer that serves as the sole source of drinking water for thecity of Medford, Oregon.

As a consultant with Dames and Moore, led geologic investigations of two contaminated sites (later listed on the Superfund NPL) in the Portland, Oregon, area and a large RCRA hazardous waste site in eastern Oregon.

Duties included the following:

- Supervising year-long effort for soil and groundwater sampling.
- Conducting aquifer tests.
- Investigating active faults beneath sites proposed for hazardous waste disposal.

**Teaching:**

From 1990 to 1998, taught at least one course per semester at the community college and university levels:

- At San Francisco State University, held an adjunct faculty position and taught courses in environmental geology, oceanography (lab and lecture), hydrogeology, and groundwater contamination.
- Served as a committee member for graduate and undergraduate students.
- Taught courses in environmental geology and oceanography at the College of Marin.
- Part time geology instructor at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California from 2010 to 2014 and in 2017.

***Summary of Testimony Experience Over Past Four Years***

*In Re New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection et al. vs. E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company, in the United States District Court, District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-14766-RMB-JBC. Deposition in 2025. Representing Plaintiffs in matters regarding contamination of groundwater, wastewater, soil, and air with per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances.*

*In Re Edmond Asher, et al., vs. RTX Corporation (f/k/a Raytheon Technologies Corporation, et al.) in the County of Huntington Superior Court, Indiana, Cause number 35D01-2006-CT-000338. Deposition in 2024. Representing Plaintiffs in matters regarding contamination of groundwater and soil vapor with trichlorethylene.*

*In Re Wright vs Consolidated Rail Corporation In the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Case No: 21L3966. Deposition in 2023, Representing Plaintiff in matters involving groundwater and drinking water contamination of perchloroethylene, trichlorethylene, 1,2-dichloroethane, and carbon tetrachloride.*

*In Re Behr Dayton Thermal Products LLC In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division at Dayton, Case No: 08-cv-326. Deposition in 2022. Representing Plaintiff in matters regarding contamination of groundwater and indoor air with perchloroethylene and trichloethelene.*

*Orange County Water District vs. Sabic Innovative Plastics US, LLC, et al. In the Court of Appeal, Fourth District,*

*Division 1, California, Case No: D070553. Deposition in 2020. Representing Plaintiff in matters involving compliance with The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).*
*Los Angeles Waterkeeper vs. AAA Plating and Inspection, Inc. In the United States District Court for the Central District of California, Case No: No. CV 18-5916 PA (GJSx). Deposition in 2019. Expert witness representing Plaintiff in matters involving contaminated stormwater runoff at an industrial facility in Compton, California.*

*Californians for Alternatives to Toxics vs. Schneider Dock and Intermodal Facility. In the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Case No: 3:17-cv-05287-JST. Deposition in 2019. Expert witness representing Plaintiff in matters involving contaminated stormwater runoff at an industrial facility in Eureka, California.*

*Bells et al. vs. The 3M Company et al. In the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, Case No: 1:16-CV-02531-RBJ. Deposition in 2018. Expert witness representing Plaintiff on matters regarding the general hydrogeological conditions present in an area impacted by per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances.*

*Ungar vs. Foundation for Affordable Housing. In the Superior Court, State of California, Los Angeles County, Case No. BC628890 Deposition in 2017. Expert witness representing defendant on matters involving alleged drinking water contamination.*

**Invited Testimony, Reports, Papers and Presentations:**

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Presentation to the Public Environmental Law Conference, Eugene, Oregon.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Invited presentation to U.S.EPA Region 9, San Francisco, California.

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2005. Use of Electronic Databases in Environmental Regulation, Policy Making andPublic Participation. Brownfields 2005, Denver, Coloradao.

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in Nevada and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Las Vegas, NV (served on conference organizing committee).

**Hagemann, M.F.**, 2004. Invited testimony to a California Senate committee hearing on air toxins atschools in Southern California, Los Angeles.

Brown, A., Farrow, J., Gray, A. and **Hagemann, M.**, 2004. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBEReleases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells.

Presentation to the Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference, National GroundwaterAssociation.

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Waterin Arizona and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Phoenix, AZ (served on conference organizing committee).

**Hagemann, M.F.,** 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Waterin the Southwestern U.S. Invited presentation to a special committee meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, Irvine, CA.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to atribal EPA meeting, Pechanga, CA.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to ameeting of tribal representatives, Parker, AZ.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Impact of Perchlorate on the Colorado River and Associated Drinking WaterSupplies. Invited presentation to the Inter-Tribal Meeting, Torres Martinez Tribe.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. The Emergence of Perchlorate as a Widespread Drinking Water Contaminant.Invited presentation to the U.S. EPA Region 9.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. A Deductive Approach to the Assessment of Perchlorate Contamination. Invited presentation to the California Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2003. Perchlorate: A Cold War Legacy in Drinking Water. Presentation to a meeting ofthe National Groundwater Association.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Presentation to ameeting of the National Groundwater Association.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater and an Estimate of Costs to AddressImpacts to Groundwater. Presentation to the annual meeting of the Society of Environmental Journalists.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. An Estimate of the Cost to Address MTBE Contamination in Groundwater(and Who Will Pay). Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2002. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells. Presentation to a meeting of the U.S. EPA andState Underground Storage Tank Program managers.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2001. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Unpublishedreport.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2001. Estimated Cleanup Cost for MTBE in Groundwater Used as Drinking Water. Unpublished report.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 2001. Estimated Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Leaking Underground StorageTanks.

Unpublished report.

**Hagemann, M.F**., and VanMouwerik, M., 1999. Potential Water Concerns Related to Snowmobile Usage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

VanMouwerik, M. and **Hagemann, M.F**. 1999, Water Quality Concerns Related to Personal WatercraftUsage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1999, Is Dilution the Solution to Pollution in National Parks? The George WrightSociety Biannual Meeting, Asheville, North Carolina.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1997, The Potential for MTBE to Contaminate Groundwater. U.S. EPA Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada.

**Hagemann, M.F**., and Gill, M., 1996, Impediments to Intrinsic Remediation, Moffett Field Naval AirStation, Conference on Intrinsic Remediation of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, Salt Lake City.

**Hagemann, M.F**., Fukunaga, G.L., 1996, The Vulnerability of Groundwater to Anthropogenic Contaminants on the Island of Maui, Hawaii. Hawaii Water Works Association Annual Meeting, Maui,October 1996.

**Hagemann, M. F**., Fukanaga, G. L., 1996, Ranking Groundwater Vulnerability in Central Oahu, Hawaii. Proceedings, Geographic Information Systems in Environmental Resources Management, Airand Waste Management Association Publication VIP-61.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1994. Groundwater Characterization and Cleanup at Closing Military Basesin California. Proceedings, California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

**Hagemann, M.**F. and Sabol, M.A., 1993. Role of the U.S. EPA in the High Plains States Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program. Proceedings, Sixth Biennial Symposium on the Artificial Recharge of Groundwater.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1993. U.S. EPA Policy on the Technical Impracticability of the Cleanup of DNAPL-contaminated Groundwater. California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

**Hagemann, M.F**., 1992. Dense Nonaqueous Phase Liquid Contamination of Groundwater: An Ounce of Prevention... Proceedings, Association of Engineering Geologists Annual Meeting, v. 35.

Other Experience:
Selected as subject matter expert for the California Professional Geologist licensing examinations,2009-2011.

---

SWAPE Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

**SOIL WATER AIR PROTECTION ENTERPRISE**
2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, California 90405
Attn: Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.
Mobil: (310) 795-2335
Office: (310) 452-5555
Fax: (310) 452-5550
**Email:** prosenfeld@swape.com

# *Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.*

**Chemical Fate and Transport & Air Dispersion Modeling**

*Principal Environmental Chemist*

**Risk Assessment & Remediation Specialist**

## Education

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on volatile organic compound filtration.

M.S. Environmental Science, U.C. Berkeley, 1995. Thesis on organic waste economics.

B.A. Environmental Studies, U.C. Santa Barbara, 1991. Focus on wastewater treatment.

## Professional Experience

Dr. Rosenfeld has over 25 years of experience conducting environmental investigations and risk assessments for evaluating impacts to human health, property, and ecological receptors. His expertise focuses on the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, human health risk, exposure assessment, and ecological restoration. Dr. Rosenfeld has evaluated and modeled emissions from oil spills, landfills, boilers and incinerators, process stacks, storage tanks, confined animal feeding operations, industrial, military and agricultural sources, unconventional oil drilling operations, and locomotive and construction engines. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources to evaluating impacts of pollution on workers at industrial facilities and residents in surrounding communities. Dr. Rosenfeld has also successfully modeled exposure to contaminants distributed by water systems and via vapor intrusion.

Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing lead, heavy metals, mold, bacteria, particulate matter, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, dioxins and furans, semi- and volatile organic compounds, PCBs, PAHs, creosote, perchlorate, asbestos, per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFOA/PFOS), unusual polymers, fuel oxygenates (MTBE), among other pollutants. Dr. Rosenfeld also has experience evaluating greenhouse gas emissions from various projects and is an expert on the assessment of odors from industrial and agricultural sites, as well as the evaluation of odor nuisance impacts and technologies for abatement of odorous emissions. As a principal scientist at SWAPE, Dr. Rosenfeld directs air dispersion modeling and exposure assessments. He has served as an expert witness and testified about pollution sources causing nuisance and/or personal injury at sites and has testified as an expert witness on numerous cases involving exposure to soil, water and air contaminants from industrial, railroad, agricultural, and military sources.

## Professional History:

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Principal and Founding Partner
UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2011; Lecturer (Assistant Researcher)
UCLA School of Public Health; 2003 to 2006; Adjunct Professor
UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering Program; 2002-2004; Doctoral Intern Coordinator
UCLA Institute of the Environment, 2001-2002; Research Associate
Komex $H_2O$ Science, 2001 to 2003; Senior Remediation Scientist
National Groundwater Association, 2002-2004; Lecturer
San Diego State University, 1999-2001; Adjunct Professor
Anteon Corp., San Diego, 2000-2001; Remediation Project Manager
Ogden (now Amec), San Diego, 2000-2000; Remediation Project Manager
Bechtel, San Diego, California, 1999 – 2000; Risk Assessor
King County, Seattle, 1996 – 1999; Scientist
James River Corp., Washington, 1995-96; Scientist
Big Creek Lumber, Davenport, California, 1995; Scientist
Plumas Corp., California and USFS, Tahoe 1993-1995; Scientist
Peace Corps and World Wildlife Fund, St. Kitts, West Indies, 1991-1993; Scientist

## Publications:

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., Spaeth, K.R., McCarthy, S.J. *et al.* Camp Lejeune Marine Cancer Risk Assessment for Exposure to Contaminated Drinking Water From 1955 to 1987. *Water Air Soil Pollut* **235**, 124 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-023-06863-y.

**Rosenfeld P.E.,** Spaeth K.R., Remy L.L., Byers V., Muerth S.A., Hallman R,C., Summers-Evans J., Barker S. (2023) Perfluoroalkyl substances exposure in firefighters: Sources and implications, *Environmental Research*, Volume 220, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.115164.

**Rosenfeld P.E.** and Spaeth K.R., (2023) Authors' Response to Letter to the Editor from Bullock and Ramacciotti, *Water Air Soil Pollution* Volume 234, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-023-06165-3

**Rosenfeld P. E.,** Spaeth K., Hallman R., Bressler R., Smith, G., (2022) Cancer Risk and Diesel Exhaust Exposure Among Railroad Workers. *Water Air Soil Pollution.* **233,** 171.

Remy, L.L., Clay T., Byers, V., **Rosenfeld P. E.** (2019) Hospital, Health, and Community Burden After Oil Refinery Fires, Richmond, California 2007 and 2012. *Environmental Health.* 18:48

Simons, R.A., Seo, Y. **Rosenfeld, P**., (2015) Modeling the Effect of Refinery Emission On Residential Property Value. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 27(3):321-342

Chen, J. A, Zapata A. R., Sutherland A. J., Molmen, D.R., Chow, B. S., Wu, L. E., **Rosenfeld, P. E.,** Hesse, R. C., (2012) Sulfur Dioxide and Volatile Organic Compound Exposure To A Community In Texas City Texas Evaluated Using Aermod and Empirical Data. *American Journal of Environmental Science*, 8(6), 622-632.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. & Feng, L. (2011). *The Risks of Hazardous Waste.* Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2011). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Gonzalez, J., Feng, L., Sutherland, A., Waller, C., Sok, H., Hesse, R., **Rosenfeld, P.** (2010). PCBs and Dioxins/Furans in Attic Dust Collected Near Former PCB Production and Secondary Copper Facilities in Sauget, IL. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*. 113–125.

Feng, L., Wu, C., Tam, L., Sutherland, A.J., Clark, J.J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). Dioxin and Furan Blood Lipid and Attic Dust Concentrations in Populations Living Near Four Wood Treatment Facilities in the United States. *Journal of Environmental Health*. 73(6), 34-46.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Wood and Paper Industries.* Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.,** (2009). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Petroleum Industry*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P**. (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Air Pollution,* 123 (17), 319-327.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** Davletshin, A.R. (2008). ***Responsible Care***. Gulf Publishing. Texas.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). A Statistical Analysis Of Attic Dust And Blood Lipid Concentrations Of Tetrachloro-p-Dibenzodioxin (TCDD) Toxicity Equivalency Quotients (TEQ) In Two Populations Near Wood Treatment Facilities. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 002252-002255.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). Methods For Collect Samples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In Attic Dust: A Review. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 000527-000530.

Hensley, A.R. A. Scott, J. J. J. Clark, **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2007). Attic Dust and Human Blood Samples Collected near a Former Wood Treatment Facility. *Environmental Research*. 105, 194-197.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** J. J. J. Clark, A. R. Hensley, M. Suffet. (2007). The Use of an Odor Wheel Classification for Evaluation of Human Health Risk Criteria for Compost Facilities. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 345-357.

**Rosenfeld, P. E., M.** Suffet. (2007). The Anatomy of Odour Wheels for Odours of Drinking Water, Wastewater, Compost And The Urban Environment. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 335-344.

Sullivan, P. J. Clark, J.J.J., Agardy, F. J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2007). *Toxic Legacy, Synthetic Toxins in the Food, Water, and Air in American Cities.* Boston Massachusetts: Elsevier Publishing

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9),171-178.

**Rosenfeld P. E.,** J.J. Clark, I.H. (Mel) Suffet (2004). The Value of An Odor-Quality-Wheel Classification Scheme for The Urban Environment. *Water Environment Federation's Technical Exhibition and Conference (WEFTEC) 2004.* New Orleans, October 2-6, 2004.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Suffet, I.H. (2004). Understanding Odorants Associated with Compost, Biomass Facilities, and the Land Application of Biosolids. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9), 193-199.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash, *Water Science and Technology*, 49(9), 171-178.

**Rosenfeld, P. E**., Grey, M. A., Sellew, P. (2004). Measurement of Biosolids Odor and Odorant Emissions from Windrows, Static Pile and Biofilter. *Water Environment Research*. 76(4), 310-315.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** Grey, M and Suffet, M. (2002). Compost Demonstration Project, Sacramento California Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Integrated Waste Management Board Public Affairs Office*, Publications Clearinghouse (MS–6), Sacramento, CA Publication #442-02-008.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., and C.L. Henry. (2001). Characterization of odor emissions from three different biosolids. *Water Soil and Air Pollution*. 127(1-4), 173-191.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Henry C. L., (2000). Wood ash control of odor emissions from biosolids application. *Journal of Environmental Quality.* 29, 1662-1668.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** C.L. Henry and D. Bennett. (2001). Wastewater dewatering polymer affects on biosolids odor emissions and microbial activity. *Water Environment Research*. 73(4), 363-367.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and C.L. Henry. (2001). Activated Carbon and Wood Ash Sorption of Wastewater, Compost, and Biosolids Odorants. *Water Environment Research*, 73, 388-393.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** and Henry C. L., (2001). High carbon wood ash effect on biosolids microbial activity and odor. *Water Environment Research*. 131(1-4), 247-262.

Chollack, T. and **P. Rosenfeld. (**1998). Compost Amendment Handbook for Landscaping. Prepared for and distributed by the City of Redmond, Washington State.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1992). The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. *Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts*, 3(2).

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1993). High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation on St. Kitts. *Biomass Users Network*, 7(1).

**Rosenfeld, P. E. (**1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Doctoral Thesis. University of Washington College of Forest Resources.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1994). Potential Utilization of Small Diameter Trees on Sierra County Public Land. Master's thesis reprinted by the Sierra County Economic Council. Sierra County, California.

**Rosenfeld, P. E. (**1991). How to Build a Small Rural Anaerobic Digester & Uses Of Biogas In The First And Third World. Bachelor's Thesis. University of California.

## Presentations:

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., "The science for Perfluorinated Chemicals (PFAS): What makes remediation so hard?" Law Seminars International, (May 9-10, 2018) 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 101 Seattle, WA.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** Sutherland, A; Hesse, R.; Zapata, A. (October 3-6, 2013). Air dispersion modeling of volatile organic emissions from multiple natural gas wells in Decatur, TX. *44th Western Regional Meeting, American Chemical Society.* Lecture conducted from Santa Clara, CA.

Sok, H.L.; Waller, C.C.; Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sutherland, A.J.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Atrazine: A Persistent Pesticide in Urban Drinking Water. *Urban Environmental Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sok, H.L.; Sutherland, A.J.; Waller, C.C.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; La, M.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Bringing Environmental Justice to East St. Louis, Illinois. *Urban Environmental Pollution.* Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. (April 19-23, 2009). Perfluoroctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluoroactane Sulfonate (PFOS) Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*, Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** (April 19-23, 2009). Cost to Filter Atrazine Contamination from Drinking Water in the United States" Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*. Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P**. (20-22 July (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. Brebbia, C.A. and Popov, V., eds., *Air Pollution XVII: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Modeling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Tallinn, Estonia.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). Moss Point Community Exposure To Contaminants From A Releasing Facility. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water.* Platform lecture conducted at University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). The Repeated Trespass of Tritium-Contaminated Water Into A Surrounding Community Form Repeated Waste Spills From A Nuclear Power Plant. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). Somerville Community Exposure To Contaminants From Wood Treatment Facility Emissions. The *23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld P. E.** (March 2007). Production, Chemical Properties, Toxicology, & Treatment Case Studies of 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (TCP). *The Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) Annual Meeting*. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

**Rosenfeld P. E.** (March 2007). Blood and Attic Sampling for Dioxin/Furan, PAH, and Metal Exposure in Florala, Alabama. *The AEHS Annual Meeting.* Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.,** Clark, J.J.J. (August 21 – 25, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *The 26th International Symposium on Halogenated Persistent Organic Pollutants – DIOXIN2006*. Lecture conducted from Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.,** Clark, J.J.J. (November 4-8, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *APHA 134 Annual Meeting & Exposition.* Lecture conducted from Boston Massachusetts.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (October 24-25, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. Mealey's C8/PFOA. *Science, Risk & Litigation Conference.* Lecture conducted from The Rittenhouse Hotel, Philadelphia, PA.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 19, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, *Toxicology and Remediation PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference*. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel, Irvine California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 19, 2005). Fate, Transport, Toxicity, And Persistence of 1,2,3-TCP. *PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference.* Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel in Irvine, California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 26-27, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PDBEs. *Mealey's Groundwater Conference.* Lecture conducted from Ritz Carlton Hotel, Marina Del Ray, California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (June 7-8, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. *International Society of Environmental Forensics: Focus on Emerging Contaminants*. Lecture conducted from Sheraton Oceanfront Hotel, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (July 21-22, 2005). Fate Transport, Persistence and Toxicology of PFOA and Related Perfluorochemicals. *2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (July 21-22, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology and Remediation. *2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference.* Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and James Clark Ph.D. and Rob Hesse R.G. (May 5-6, 2004). Tert-butyl Alcohol Liability and Toxicology, A National Problem and Unquantified Liability. *National Groundwater Association. Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Congress Plaza Hotel, Chicago Illinois.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (March 2004). Perchlorate Toxicology. *Meeting of the American Groundwater Trust*. Lecture conducted from Phoenix Arizona.

Hagemann, M.F., **Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and Rob Hesse (2004). Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. *Meeting of tribal representatives*. Lecture conducted from Parker, AZ.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (April 7, 2004). A National Damage Assessment Model for PCE and Dry Cleaners. *Drycleaner Symposium. California Ground Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Radison Hotel, Sacramento, California.

**Rosenfeld, P. E**., Grey, M., (June 2003) Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Seventh International In Situ And On Site Bioremediation Symposium Battelle Conference* Orlando, FL.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and James Clark Ph.D. (February 20-21, 2003) Understanding Historical Use, Chemical Properties, Toxicity and Regulatory Guidance of 1,4 Dioxane. *National Groundwater Association. Southwest Focus Conference. Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants*. Lecture conducted from Hyatt Regency Phoenix Arizona.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (February 6-7, 2003). Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *California CUPA Forum*. Lecture conducted from Marriott Hotel, Anaheim California.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D**. (October 23, 2002) Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *EPA Underground Storage Tank Roundtable*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Understanding Odor from Compost, *Wastewater and Industrial Processes. Sixth Annual Symposium on Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Using High Carbon Wood Ash to Control Compost Odor. *Sixth Annual Symposium on Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** and Grey, M. A. (September 22-24, 2002). Biocycle Composting for Coastal Sage Restoration. *Northwest Biosolids Management Association*. Lecture conducted from Vancouver Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Grey, M. A. (November 11-14, 2002). Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Soil Science Society Annual Conferenc*e. Lecture conducted from Indianapolis, Maryland.

**Rosenfeld. P.E.** (September 16, 2000). Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Water Environment Federation.* Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

**Rosenfeld. P.E. (**October 16, 2000). Wood ash and biofilter control of compost odor. *Biofest.* Lecture conducted from Ocean Shores, California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E. (**2000). Bioremediation Using Organic Soil Amendments. *California Resource Recovery Association*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation with High-Carbon Wood-Ash. *Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings*. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, and C.L. Henry. (1999). An evaluation of ash incorporation with biosolids for odor reduction. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Salt Lake City Utah.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Comparison of Microbial Activity and Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Brown and Caldwell.* Lecture conducted from Seattle Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. *Biofest.* Lecture conducted from Lake Chelan, Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E,** C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation with High-Carbon Wood-Ash. Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. B. Harrison, and R. Dills. (1997). Comparison of Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

## Teaching Experience:

UCLA Department of Environmental Health (Summer 2003 through 20010) Taught Environmental Health Science 100 to students, including undergrad, medical doctors, public health professionals and nurses. The course focused on the health effects of environmental contaminants.

National Ground Water Association, Successful Remediation Technologies. Custom Course in Sante Fe, New Mexico. May 21, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of fuel contaminants associated with underground storage tanks.

National Ground Water Association; Successful Remediation Technologies Course in Chicago Illinois. April 1, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of contaminants associated with Superfund and RCRA sites.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, April and May 2001. Alternative Landfill Caps Seminar in San Diego, Ventura, and San Francisco. Focused on both prescriptive and innovative landfill cover design.

UCLA Department of Environmental Engineering, February 5, 2002. Seminar on Successful Remediation Technologies focusing on Groundwater Remediation.

University Of Washington, Soil Science Program, Teaching Assistant for several courses including Soil Chemistry, Organic Soil Amendments, and Soil Stability.

U.C. Berkeley, Environmental Science Program Teaching Assistant for Environmental Science 10.

## Academic Grants Awarded:

California Integrated Waste Management Board. $41,000 grant awarded to UCLA Institute of the Environment. Goal: To investigate the effect of high carbon wood ash on volatile organic emissions from compost. 2001.

Synagro Technologies, Corona California: $10,000 grant awarded to San Diego State University.
Goal: investigate the effect of biosolids for restoration and remediation of degraded coastal sage soils. 2000.

King County, Department of Research and Technology, Washington State. $100,000 grant awarded to University of Washington: Goal: To investigate odor emissions from biosolids application and the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions. 1998.

Northwest Biosolids Management Association, Washington State. $20,000 grant awarded to investigate the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions from biosolids. 1997.

James River Corporation, Oregon: $10,000 grant was awarded to investigate the success of genetically engineered Poplar trees with resistance to round-up. 1996.

United State Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest: $15,000 grant was awarded to investigating fire ecology of the Tahoe National Forest. 1995.

Kellogg Foundation, Washington D.C. $500 grant was awarded to construct a large anaerobic digester on St. Kitts in West Indies. 1993

## Deposition and/or Trial Testimony:

In the District Court of Harris County Texas
Mt Davis Interest, Inc v Sesco Cement Corp
Cause No 2023-26512
Trial 6-6-2-25

In the United States Southern District of New York
Gallo vs Avon Products Inc., et al
Civil Action No.: 1:23-cv-2023
Deposition 4-24-2025

In Vanderburgh Superior Court 5, County of Vanderburgh, Indiana
Markello v CSX
Civil Action No 82D05-2011-CT-004962
Deposition 3-26-25

Iin the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Jarosiewicz v Northeast Regional Railroad
Case No 2023 L 002290
Deposition 2-27-25

In the District Court 191st Judicial District Dallas County
Acklin v Poly America International
Cause No DC-22-08610
Deposition 1-8-2025

United States District Court, Norther District of California
Asustin Vs Monsanto
Case No 2:23-cv-272
Deposition 12-20-25

In Jefferson Circuit Court Division One, Louisville, Kentucky
Stafford vs, CSX
Case No. 18-CI-001790

Deposition: 8-27-24

In the Twenty-Second Judicial Circuit of St. Louis. State of Missouri
Patricia Godfrey vs, Amtrak
Case No. 2122-CC-00525
Deposition: 7-17-24

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Linda Early Vs. CSX
Case number CV-2021-00241
Deposition 6-24-24

In the Court of Common Please Lucas County, Ohio
Brenda Conkright vs. CSX
Case No. G-4801-CI-0202102664-000
Deposition: 6-4-24

In the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Greenup Circuit Court
Patsy Sue Napier vs. CSX
Case No. 19-CI-0012
Deposition: 5-8-2-24

In United States District Court of Hawaii
Patrick Feindt, Jr. et al. vs. The United States of America
Case No. 1:22-cv-LEK-KJM
Trial 3-29-24 and 4-5-24

In the District Court of Hood County State of Texas
Artie Gray vs. Exxon Mobil
Case No. C-2018047
Rosenfeld Deposition:4-22-2024

In the Elkhart Superior Court State of Indiana
Estate of Clark Stacy vs. Penn Central Corporation
Cause No 2D01-2001-CT-00007
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-25-2024 and 3-7-2024

In the Circuit Court of Trempealeau County, State of Wisconsin
Michael J. Sylla et al. vs. High-Crush Whitehall LLC
Case No. 2019-CV-63, 2019-CV-64, 2019-CV-65, 2019-CV-66
Rosenfeld Deposition: 3-5-2024

In the Circuit Court of Trempealeau County, State of Wisconsin
Leland Drangstveit vs. High-Crush Blair LLC
Case No. 19-CV-66
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-5-2024

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Donald Lee Ashworth vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No CV-2021-901261
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-23-2024

In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
Gary L Siepe vs. Soo Line Railroad
Case No. 2:21-cv-00919
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-19-2024

In the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana
Ricky Bush v. Clean Harbors Colfax LLC
Case No. 1:22-cv-02026-DDD-JPM
Rosenfeld Deposition 12-18-2023 and 1-15-2024

In United States District Court of Hawaii
Patrick Feindt, Jr. et al. vs. The United States of America
Case No. 1:22-cv-LEK-KJM
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-29-2023

In the Circuit Court for the Twentieth Judicial Circuit St. Clair County, Illinois
Timothy Gray vs. Rural King et al.
Case No 2022-LA-355
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-26-2023

In United States District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin
Gary L. Siepe vs. Soo Line Railroad Company
Case No. 2:21-cv-00919
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-15-2023

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Donald Fox vs. BNSF
Case No. 2021 L12
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-12-2023

In the Court of Common Please Cuyahoga County, Ohio
Thomas Schleich vs. Penn Central Corporation
Lead Case No. CV-20-939184
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-27-2023

In the Circuit Court of Jackson County Missouri at Kansas City
Timothy Dalsing vs. BNSF
Case No. No. 2216-cv06539
Rosenfeld Deposition 7-28-2023

In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas Houston Division
International Terminals Company LLC Deer Park Fire Litigation
Lead Case No. 4:19-cv-01460
Rosenfeld Deposition 7-25-2023

In the Circuit Court of Livingston County Missouri
Shirley Ralls vs. Canadian Pacific Railway and Soo Lind Railroad
Case No. 28LV-CV0020
Rosenfeld Daubert Hearing 7-18-2023 Trial Testimony 7-19-2023

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Brenda Wright vs. Penn Central and Conrail
Case No. No. 2032L003966
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-13-2023

In the Circuit Court Common Please Philadelphia of Jefferson County Alabama
Frank Belle vs. Birmingham Southern Railroad Company et al.
Case No. 01-cv-2021-900901.00
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-6-2023

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Linda De Gregorio vs. Penn Central
Case No. 002278
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-27-20203

In the United States District Court Eastern District of New York
Rosalie Romano et al. vs. Northrup Grumman Corporation
Case No. 16-cv-5760
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-16-2023

In the Superior Court of Washington, Spokane County
Judy Cundy vs. BNSF
Case No. 21-2-03718-32
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-9-2023

In The Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, PA Civil Trial Division
Feaster v Conrail
Case No. 001075
Rosenfeld Deposition 2-1-2023

In United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
Sherman vs. BNSF
Case No. 3:17-cv-01192
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-18-2023

In United States District Court District of Colorado
Gonzales vs. BNSF
Case No. 1:21-cv-01690
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-17-2023

In United States District Court District of Colorado
Abeyta vs. BNSF
Case No. 1:21-cv-01689-KMT
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-3-2023

In United States District Court For The Easter District of Louisiana
Nathaniel Smith vs. Illinois Central Railroad
Case No. 2:21-cv-01235
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-30-2022

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Billy Wildrick, Plaintiff vs. BNSF Railway Company
Case No. CIVDS1711810
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-17-2022

In the State Court of Bibb County, State of Georgia
Richard Hutcherson, Plaintiff vs Norfolk Southern Railway Company
Case No. 10-SCCV-092007
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2022

In the Civil District Court of the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana
Millard Clark, Plaintiff vs. Dixie Carriers, Inc. et al.
Case No. 2020-03891
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-15-2022

In The Circuit Court of Livingston County, State of Missouri, Circuit Civil Division

Shirley Ralls, Plaintiff vs. Canadian Pacific Railway and Soo Line Railroad
Case No. 18-LV-CC0020
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-7-2022

In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jonny C. Daniels, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. 20-CA-5502
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-1-2022

In The Circuit Court of St. Louis County, State of Missouri
Kieth Luke et. al. Plaintiff vs. Monsanto Company et. al.
Case No. 19SL-CC03191
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-25-2022

In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jeffery S. Lamotte, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. NO. 20-CA-0049
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-22-2022

In State of Minnesota District Court, County of St. Louis Sixth Judicial District
Greg Bean, Plaintiff vs. Soo Line Railroad Company
Case No. 69-DU-CV-21-760
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-17-2022

In United States District Court Western District of Washington at Tacoma, Washington
John D. Fitzgerald Plaintiff vs. BNSF
Case No. 3:21-cv-05288-RJB
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-11-2022

In Circuit Court of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, Macon Illinois
Rocky Bennyhoff Plaintiff vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-L-56
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-3-2022, Trial 1-10-2023

In Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County Ohio
Joe Briggins Plaintiff vs. CSX
Case No. A2004464
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-17-2022

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern
George LaFazia vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. BCV-19-103087
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-17-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Bobby Earles vs. Penn Central et. al.
Case No. 2020-L-000550
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-16-2022

In United States District Court Easter District of Florida
Albert Hartman Plaintiff vs. Illinois Central
Case No. 2:20-cv-1633
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-4-2022

In the Circuit Court of the 4th Judicial Circuit, in and For Duval County, Florida
Barbara Steele vs. CSX Transportation

Case No.16-219-Ca-008796
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2022

In United States District Court Easter District of New York
Romano et al. vs. Northrup Grumman Corporation
Case No. 16-cv-5760
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-10-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Linda Benjamin vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 007599
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Donald Smith vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 003426
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-24-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Jan Holeman vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 000675
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-18-2022

In the State Court of Bibb County State of Georgia
Dwayne B. Garrett vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-SCCV-091232
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-10-2021

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Ruepke vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 007730
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-5-2021

In the United States District Court For the District of Nebraska
Steven Gillett vs. BNSF
Case No. 4:20-cv-03120
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-28-2021

In the Montana Thirteenth District Court of Yellowstone County
James Eadus vs. Soo Line Railroad and BNSF
Case No. DV 19-1056
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-21-2021

In the Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al. vs Cerro Flow Products, Inc.
Case No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-14-2021
Trial October 8-4-2021

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Rafferty vs. Consolidated Rail Corporation and National Railroad Passenger Corporation d/b/a AMTRAK,
Case No. 18-L-6845
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-28-2021

In the United States District Court For the Northern District of Illinois

Theresa Romcoe vs. Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation d/b/a METRA Rail
Case No. 17-cv-8517
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-25-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of Arizona In and For the Cunty of Maricopa
Mary Tryon et al. vs. The City of Pheonix v. Cox Cactus Farm, L.L.C., Utah Shelter Systems, Inc.
Case No. CV20127-094749
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-7-2021

In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas Beaumont Division
Robinson, Jeremy et al vs. CNA Insurance Company et al.
Case No. 1:17-cv-000508
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-25-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Gary Garner, Personal Representative for the Estate of Melvin Garner vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. 1720288
Rosenfeld Deposition 2-23-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Spring Street Courthouse
Benny M Rodriguez vs. Union Pacific Railroad, A Corporation, et al.
Case No. 18STCV01162
Rosenfeld Deposition 12-23-2020

In the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri
Karen Cornwell, Plaintiff, vs. Marathon Petroleum, LP, Defendant.
Case No. 1716-CV10006
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-30-2019

In the United States District Court For The District of New Jersey
Duarte et al, Plaintiffs, vs. United States Metals Refining Company et. al. Defendant.
Case No. 2:17-cv-01624-ES-SCM
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-7-2019

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
M/T Carla Maersk vs. Conti 168., Schiffahrts-GMBH & Co. Bulker KG MS "Conti Perdido" Defendant.
Case No. 3:15-CV-00106 consolidated with 3:15-CV-00237
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-9-2019

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
Carole-Taddeo-Bates et al., vs. Ifran Khan et al., Defendants
Case No. BC615636
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2019

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments et al. vs El Adobe Apts. Inc. et al., Defendants
Case No. BC646857
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2018; Trial 3-7-19

In United States District Court For The District of Colorado
Bells et al. Plaintiffs vs. The 3M Company et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:16-cv-02531-RBJ
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2018 and 4-3-2018

In The District Court Of Regan County, Texas, 112th Judicial District
Phillip Bales et al., Plaintiff vs. Dow Agrosciences, LLC, et al., Defendants

Cause No. 1923
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-17-2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Contra Costa
Simons et al., Plaintifs vs. Chevron Corporation, et al., Defendants
Cause No. C12-01481
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-20-2017

In The Circuit Court of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al., Plaintiff vs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc., Defendants
Case No.: No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-23-2017

In United States District Court For The Southern District of Mississippi
Guy Manuel vs. The BP Exploration et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:19-cv-00315-RHW
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-22-2020

In The Superior Court of the State of California, For The County of Los Angeles
Warrn Gilbert and Penny Gilber, Plaintiff vs. BMW of North America LLC
Case No. LC102019 (c/w BC582154)
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-16-2017, Trail 8-28-2018

In the Northern District Court of Mississippi, Greenville Division
Brenda J. Cooper, et al., Plaintifs, vs. Meritor Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 4:16-cv-52-DMB-JVM
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of Washington, County of Snohomish
Michael Davis and Julie Davis et al., Plaintiff vs. Cedar Grove Composting Inc., Defendants
Case No. 13-2-03987-5
Rosenfeld Deposition, February 2017
Trial March 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda
Charles Spain., Plaintiff vs. Thermo Fisher Scientific, et al., Defendants
Case No. RG14711115
Rosenfeld Deposition September 2015

In The Iowa District Court In And For Poweshiek County
Russell D. Winburn, et al., Plaintiffs vs. Doug Hoksbergen, et al., Defendants
Case No. LALA002187
Rosenfeld Deposition August 2015

In The Circuit Court of Ohio County, West Virginia
Robert Andrews, et al. vs. Antero, et al.
Civil Action No. 14-C-30000
Rosenfeld Deposition June 2015

In The Iowa District Court for Muscatine County
Laurie Freeman et. al. Plaintiffs vs. Grain Processing Corporation, Defendant
Case No. 4980
Rosenfeld Deposition May 2015

In the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit, in and For Broward County, Florida
Walter Hinton, et. al. Plaintiff, vs. City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a Municipality, Defendant.

Case No. CACE07030358 (26)
Rosenfeld Deposition December 2014

In the United States District Court Western District of Oklahoma
Tommy McCarty, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Oklahoma City Landfill, LLC d/b/a Southeast Oklahoma City Landfill, et al. Defendants.
Case No. 5:12-cv-01152-C
Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2014

In the County Court of Dallas County Texas
Lisa Parr et al, *Plaintiff*, vs. Aruba et al, *Defendant.*
Case Number cc-11-01650-E
Rosenfeld Deposition: March and September 2013
Rosenfeld Trial: April 2014

In the County of Kern, Unlimited Jurisdiction
Rose Propagation Services vs. Heppe Enterprises
Case No. S-1500-CV-278190, LHB
Rosenfeld Deposition: May 2014

In the Circuit Court of Baltimore County Maryland
Philip E. Cvach, II et al., *Plaintiffs* vs. Two Farms, Inc. d/b/a Royal Farms, Defendants
Case Number: 03-C-12-012487 OT
Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2013

In the Court of Galveston County, Texas 56th Judicial District
MDL Litigation Regarding Texas City Refinery Ultracracker Emission Event Litigation
Cause No. 10-UC-0001
Rosenfeld Deposition: March 2013
Rosenfeld Trial: September 2013

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
Kyle Cannon, Eugene Donovan, Genaro Ramirez, Carol Sassler, and Harvey Walton, each Individually and on behalf of those similarly situated, *Plaintiffs,* vs. BP Products North America, Inc., *Defendant.*
Case 3:10-cv-00622
Rosenfeld Deposition: February 2012
Rosenfeld Trial: April 2013

In the United States District court of Southern District of California
United States of America, Plaintiff vs. 2,560 Acres of Land, more or less, located in Imperial County, State of California; and Donald L. Crawford, et. al.
Civil No. 3:11-cv-02258-IEG-RBB
Rosenfeld Deposition: December 2012, January 2013

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition October 2012

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., *Plaintiffs,* vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., *Defendants*
Case Number: 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition: October 2012

In the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, Northern Division
James K. Benefield, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. International Paper Company, Defendant.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bullock, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 6 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, and 251072 |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 12:18:52 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 6 Letters Regarding Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

Hello,

Please see attached 6 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | D M LaPointe |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Submission of WTPCC Letter to the Land Use & Transportation Committee |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 11:20:45 AM |
| **Attachments:** | WTPCC-LU-upzoning - 12-1-25.docx |

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

Dear Chair and Clerk,

Please find attached the West of Twin Peaks Central Council's letter regarding the Family Zoning Plan for consideration by the Land Use & Transportation Committee. We respectfully request that this letter be entered into the official record for the upcoming hearing.

Thank you for your attention.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

# West of Twin Peaks Central Council

*A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936*

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/


December 1, 2025

Chair and Members of the Land Use & Transportation Committee:

On behalf of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council and the thousands of homeowners and families we represent, we register our firm and unequivocal opposition to the Family Zoning Plan unless it is substantially amended.

We believe in housing. We believe in growth. And we have proved it - approving and welcoming thousands of new homes at Stonestown, Parkmerced, Balboa Reservoir, and throughout our corridors. Our neighborhoods have done our part and remain ready to do more.

But this proposal is not real planning. It is paper compliance masquerading as progress, shifting the costs and destabilizing impacts onto the very neighborhoods that have kept San Francisco livable, stable, and resilient.

The City's own financial analysis makes one fact unavoidable: only mid-rise redevelopment pencils out. That means this plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes - not on transit corridors already upzoned by SB 79, but deep inside long-standing, middle-class neighborhoods. SB 79 is already the law. Local zoning will be overridden in 2032. The City should be defending its residents - homeowners and long-term residents alike - not eliminating their remaining protections through density decontrol.

Density decontrol must be removed. Without that amendment, the plan reads as a teardown blueprint, not a family housing strategy.

A central flaw in the proposal is the assumption that so-called "well-resourced neighborhoods" should absorb the city's unmet housing goals, even though these areas do not have the infrastructure capacity to support significant added density. This approach contradicts the City's own service and transit data. Effective equity planning pairs new housing with targeted investment in under-served communities - expanding transit, upgrading utilities, and improving public services where it will meaningfully reduce disparities. Concentrating demolition incentives in stable neighborhoods while leaving actual inequities unaddressed is not sound planning and does not advance the City's stated equity goals.

WTPCC therefore urges the Committee to adopt these essential changes:

**Eliminate density decontrol.**
It is unnecessary, inequitable, and guaranteed to trigger speculative demolition pressure.

**Protect small businesses and merchant corridors.**
West Portal, Taraval, and Lakeside cannot absorb displacement without losing the local merchants who define them.

**Restore design review, public notice, and protection of historic resources.**
Residents - especially longtime homeowners - have the right to transparency. Eliminating due process is unjustifiable.

**Guarantee strong protections for existing homeowners and long-term residents.**
Middle-class families, whether they rent or own, are the backbone of San Francisco and deserve respect, stability, and a meaningful voice.

At the same time, WTPCC and its members are committed partners in real solutions -and we are sounding this alarm now because the unintended consequences of this plan will be profound and irreversible if the City does not course-correct. We stand ready to help the City unlock and incentivize the more than 70,000 approved units already in the pipeline - homes that can be delivered now, without destabilizing established neighborhoods or erasing neighborhood identity.

Our stable, historic, family-oriented neighborhoods are not obstacles - they are the civic bedrock and democratic center of gravity of this city, composed of taxpayers who keep San Francisco running. To ignore this constituency and insist that one community upend its way of life to cover for years of government failure is not equity - it is a fundamental injustice. No credible planning effort punishes families and homeowners for problems created by City Hall.

If the City is serious about housing, it will focus on the 70,000 units already approved - not dismantle the neighborhoods that sustain the city.

Amend this plan. Protect homeowners and tenants, small business and historic resources. And prove that San Francisco can grow without sacrificing the very neighborhoods that make it worth fighting for.

Sincerely,

Denise LaPointe
President | WTPCC

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors and Members
WTPCC Delegates

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | James Lloyd |
| **To:** | Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney |
| **Subject:** | public comment re Family Zoning plan for today"s Land Use Committee meeting |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 9:16:51 AM |
| **Attachments:** | CFH v BH - 2023-12-21 - Judgment.pdf<br>San Francisco - Family Zoning Plan - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.12.01.pdf<br>ucb-examining-local-law-policy-planning-practice-on-development-in-sf-using-cales.pdf |

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund and Californians for Homeownership submit the attached public comment (and referenced attachments) for today's Land Use Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning Plan, agendized as items 2 through 9.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Electronically Received 10/27/2023 11:58 PM

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
12/21/2023
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: M. Mort Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

| | |
|---|---|
| CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation,<br><br>Petitioner,<br><br>v.<br><br>CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS,<br><br>Respondent. | Case No. 23STCP00143<br><br>**[~~PROPOSED~~] JUDGMENT**<br><br>Assigned for all purposes to:<br>Hon. Curtis A. Kin (Dept. 82) |

On September 12, 2023, the Court held a hearing on Petitioner's Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate. After considering the parties' papers and oral argument, the Court issued the decision attached hereto as Exhibit A.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED**:

1. Judgment is entered in favor of Petitioner on the Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate.

2. A writ of mandate shall issue pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 and Government Code section 65754 (a) requiring Respondent to bring the housing element of its general plan into substantial compliance with state law within 120 days of the date of this judgment, (b) requiring Respondent to bring its zoning ordinance into consistency with the housing element of its general plan within 120 days of the amendment required by (a), and (c) requiring Respondent to

file a return to the writ within 250 days of the date of this judgment.

3. Pursuant to subdivision (a)(1) of Government Code section 65755, the Court hereby suspends the authority of Respondent to issue building permits pursuant to Division 13 (commencing with section 17910) of the Health and Safety Code, and all other related permits, except for permits that create new residential bedrooms or units, and except for permits subject to subdivision (b) of Government Code section 65755, until the City has substantially complied with the requirements of Article 5 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code (commencing with Government Code Section 65300).

4. The Court hereby declares that Respondent City of Beverly Hills has not adopted a substantially compliant general plan housing element

5. Petitioner is entitled to recover its reasonable and legally-authorized costs pursuant to a memorandum of costs to be subsequently filed with the Court.

Dated: 12/21/2023

Curtis A. Kin/Judge

Hon. Curtis A. Kin
Judge of the Superior Court

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of October, 2023
CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.

Matthew P. Gelfand

Attorneys for Petitioner CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.

# EXHIBIT A

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
SEP 12 2023
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By: M. Mort, Deputy

**Superior Court of California**
**County of Los Angeles**

| | |
|---|---|
| CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.,<br><br>Petitioner,<br><br>vs.<br><br>CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS,<br><br>Respondent. | Case No. 23STCP00143<br><br>**RULING ON VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE**<br><br>Dept. 82 (Hon. Curtis A. Kin) |

Petitioner Californians for Homeownership, Inc. petitions for a writ of mandate directing respondent City of Beverly Hills to adopt a revised housing element pursuant to Government Code § 65754.

## I. Factual Background

The State of California requires each city to have a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development" of the city. (Gov. Code § 65300.)[1] Each general plan must have a housing element. (§ 65302(c).) The housing element consists of 'standards and plans for housing sites in the municipality that 'shall endeavor to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community.' [Citations.]" (*California Building Industry Assn. v. City of San Jose* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 435, 444; *see also* § 65580 [legislative findings concerning housing element law].)

"A municipality must review its housing element for the appropriateness of its housing goals, objectives, and policies and must revise the housing element in accordance with a statutory schedule." (*Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193, 222, citing § 65588(a), (b).) "The interval between the due dates for

[1] All statutory references are to the Government Code, unless otherwise specified.

the revised housing element is referred to as a planning period or cycle, which usually is eight years." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 222, citing § 65588(e)(3), (f)(1).)

"A revised housing element's assessment of needs must quantify the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels, which includes the locality's proportionate share of regional housing needs for each income level." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing § 65583(a)(1).) "The projected regional housing needs for a planning period are determined by the HCD [Department of Housing and Community Development] in consultation with regional 'councils of government.'" (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing §§ 65584(a) & (b), 65584.01, 65588(e)(3).) "Based on the HCD's regional housing needs determination, each regional council of governments adopts a 'final regional housing need plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need' among the cities and counties within its region." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing § 65584(b).)

For the 2021-2029 planning period, the City Council of respondent City of Beverly Hills ("City") adopted a housing element on October 12, 2021 and submitted it for review to HCD. (JR 776.) On January 14, 2022, HCD determined that the housing element did not fully comply with the housing element law and provided necessary revisions. (JR 1309-16.)

On September 28, 2022, the City submitted a revised housing element to HCD. (JR 776.) On November 28, 2022, HCD determined that the revised housing element did not fully comply with the housing element law and provided necessary revisions. (JR 1318-24.)

On February 21, 2023, after having revised the September 2022 housing element, the City adopted the revision. (JR 5.) On February 21, 2023, petitioner Californians for Homeownership, Inc., who monitors local compliance with the housing element law, sent a letter to the City asserting that the revised housing element was inadequate for reasons identified by HCD and petitioner. (JR 1584-85.) On May 12, 2023, HCD determined that the housing element does not substantially comply with housing element law. (RJN Ex. B.)

## II. Procedural History

On January 18, 2023, petitioner filed a verified petition for writ of mandate. On May 24, 2023, pursuant to stipulation, petitioner filed a verified first amended petitioner for writ of mandate.

On June 22, 2023, during the trial setting conference, the Court set the hearing on the instant petition for September 12, 2023.

On July 14, 2023, petitioner filed an opening brief. On August 15, 2023, respondent filed an opposition. On August 31, 2023, petitioner filed a reply.

## III. Request for Judicial Notice

Petitioner's requests for judicial notice are ruled on as follows:

- Exhibit A (September 15, 2017 Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1397 (2017-2018 Session)) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c); *Wood v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals* (2023) 88 Cal.App.5th 742, 751, fn. 4)

- Exhibit B (May 12, 2023 Letter from HCD to City) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

- Exhibit C (Staff Report for June 22, 2023 Meeting of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit D (Minutes of June 22, 2023 Meeting of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit E (Resolution No. 1907 of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit F (2022 Form 10-K for Creative Media & Community Trust Corporation (Excerpts)) – DENIED

- Exhibit G (June 10, 2020 Memorandum of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, Entitled "Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook") – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

- Exhibit H (City of Gardena's 2021-2029 Housing Element, Table C-1) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

With respect to denying the request for judicial notice of Exhibits C, D, E, and F, the Court notes these exhibits are extra-record evidence petitioner presents to demonstrate that certain sites listed in the sites inventory of the housing element are improperly included. For the reason stated in section V.C below, this is improper. The exhibits are accordingly irrelevant. (*Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1057, 1063 ["Although a court may judicially notice a variety of matters (Evid. Code, § 450 *et seq.*), only relevant material may be noticed"].)

## IV. Standard of Review

CCP § 1085(a) provides: "A writ of mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station, or to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to

which the party is entitled, and from which the party is unlawfully precluded by that inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person."

"Any action brought by any interested party to review the conformity with the provisions of this article of any housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto shall be brought pursuant to Section 1085 of the Code of Civil Procedure; the court's review of compliance with the provisions of this article shall extend to whether the housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto substantially complies with the requirements of this article." (§ 65587(b); *see also* § 65751.) Substantial compliance means "actual compliance in respect to the substance essential to every reasonable objective of the statute, as distinguished from mere technical imperfections of form." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 237, internal citations omitted.)

"[A] city's adoption of a housing element is a legislative enactment, something which is generally entitled to some deference." (*Fonseca v. City of Gilroy* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1174, 1191.) "If the municipality has substantially complied with statutory requirements, we will not interfere with its legislative action, unless that action was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support." (*Ibid.*) The challenging party has the burden to demonstrate that the housing element is inadequate. (*Ibid.*)

## V. Analysis

### A. This Dispute is Not Moot

As a preliminary matter, respondent asserts that the City anticipates adopting a revised housing element in November of this year to address concerns about the current housing element. (Wiener Decl. ¶ 2.) However, there is no guarantee that a revision will be completed by November or that the City will adopt a revision at that time, or at any time thereafter. The Court can only rule based on the current housing element. The instant petition is entitled to preference. (§ 65752.) Further, if the Court were to enter judgment in favor of petitioner, the housing element law provides deadlines for the City to address the deficiencies in the housing element and to submit the revision to HCD. (§ 65754(a).) If respondent were to appeal, the appeal would be given preference also. (§ 65752.) Accordingly, there is no reason to delay ruling on the merits of the operative first amended petition.

### B. Whether Sites Inventory Meets Statutory Requirements

#### 1. Realistic Development Capacity

The inventory in a housing element must "specify for each site the number of units that can realistically be accommodated on that site and whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing, moderate-income housing, or above moderate-income housing." (§ 65583.2(c).) For a city that does not require a

minimum residential density,[2] the city "shall demonstrate how the number of units determined for [each] site...will be accommodated." (§ 65583.2(c)(1).) As part of the calculation, " [t]he number of units calculated...shall be adjusted as necessary, based on the land use controls and site improvements requirement identified in paragraph (5) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, the realistic development capacity for the site, typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction, and on the current or planned availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities." (§ 65583.2(c)(2).)

An "assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs" shall include an "analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels...including land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, local processing and permit procedures, and any locally adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development." (§ 65583(a)(5).)

To demonstrate that its inventory is adequate, respondent relies on a Mixed Use Overlay Zone ("Overlay Zone") adopted by ordinance on November 17, 2020, where the maximum residential density within the zone was increased from 0 in commercial areas to 79.2 units/acre. (JR 200, 209.) The Overlay Zone spans the length of the City from east to west and partially north to south, along its largest commercial corridors, including Wilshire Boulevard, Robertson Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, South Doheny Drive, and South Beverly Drive. (JR 125; *see also* JR 213 [map of Overlay Zone].) In the housing element, the City describes the purported benefits of the Overlay Zone: "This wide-scale rezoning allows for the creation or conversion of non-residential space into residential units, and therefore will create all net new housing, since it does not involve the displacement of any existing occupied housing/residents." (JR 125.)

Respondent argues that the maximum residential density exceeds the minimum 30 units per acre that is statutorily deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income individuals. (§ 65583.2(c)(3)(B)(iv).) Respondent also argues that existing commercial buildings in the Overlay Zone may obtain a permit to convert to a mixed-use building and obtain relief from having to comply with standards concerning parking requirements, loading facilities, outdoor living space, commercial-residential transitional setbacks, or height limits if compliance is physically infeasible. (JR 1636; *see also* Chen Decl. Ex. G [Beverly Hills Municipal Code ("BMMC") § 10-3-1888].) The vacancy rates for commercial buildings also purportedly create an incentive for commercial building owners to convert their buildings to mixed-use projects. (JR 201.)

---

[2] It is undisputed Beverly Hills does not mandate a minimum residential density.

For commercial properties listed in the sites inventory of the housing element that were designated for conversion or indicated as having conversion potential (JR 229-34), to calculate the total number of units on the site, the City multiplied the total parcel size by the maximum allowable residential density.[3] However, the total parcel size listed in the sites inventory refers to land area, not the square footage of the existing building that can accommodate residential units. Contrary to respondent's contention, the sites inventory does not account for floor area capacity; the sites inventory lists the height limit of the building, not the number of stories to be converted to residential use. (*See, e.g.,* JR 229 [column name is "Height Limit (stories)," 233 [8500 Wilshire Blvd. described as "8 story building – conversion," but height limit is 3 stories].) As a result, for buildings to be converted to mixed use, the housing element does not demonstrate how the number of units indicated in the sites inventory will be accommodated, as required by section 65583.2(c)(1).

Moreover, as petitioner points out in the reply, most of the sites in the City's sites inventory are not designated as conversions or potential conversions. (JR 229-34.) For sites not indicated as conversions, any construction of residential units is subject to land use and building controls. For example, multi-family developments are subject to height limits from three to five stories. (JR 153-54.) Any building in the Overlay Zone must include commercial uses on the ground floor, and residential uses on the first floor within the first 40 feet from the street are prohibited. (BMMC §§ 10-3-1877(C), 10-3-1879.) Moreover, each multi-family development must have at least 200 square feet for each dwelling unit, excluding front yards, balconies, and pedestrian accessways. (BHMC §§ 10-3-1886, 10-3-2803.)

The sites inventory contains no adjustment based on land use controls for new construction, as required by section 65583.2(c)(2). Rather, like the sites designated as conversions, the number of units for each site is calculated based on the land area multiplied by the maximum residential density. Moreover, the housing element contains no meaningful consideration and analysis of the governmental constraints on the development of housing, as required by § 65583(a)(5). Rather, the City relies on prior approved and proposed developments in arguing in conclusory fashion that "the current standards are not inhibiting development of housing." (JR 158-159, 203-04.) Accordingly, the housing element, including the sites inventory, fails to account for the realistic development capacity for the sites listed in the inventory.

With respect to respondent's contention that the maximum residential density exceeds the density set forth in section 65583.2(c)(3)(B)(iv), this only means that the

---

[3] For example, for 8730 Wilshire Blvd., the parcel size is 11,863 square feet. (JR 233.) There are 1/43,560 acres in one square foot. (*See* https://www.britannica.com/science/acre-unit-of-measurement [43,560 square feet in 1 acre].) 11,863 square feet multiplied by 1/43,560 acre per square foot is 0.27 acres. 0.27 acres multiplied by 79.2 units per acre is approximately 21 units.

City does not have to provide an analysis demonstrating how its adopted density accommodates its share of the regional housing need for lower income households. (§ 65583.2(c)(3)(A-B).) However, the City still must adjust the number of units for each site based on the realistic development capacity of the site under section 65583.2(c)(1) and (c)(2) and provide an "analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the...development of housing for all income levels" under section 65583(a)(5).

Petitioner also argues that the City designated the majority of the sites on the sites inventory as 100% low-income or 100% moderate-income housing without explaining the basis for such designation. (OB at 10:6-7.) Petitioner further argues that the City did not adjust the unit counts based on "typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction," as required by section 65583.2(c)(2). (OB 10:7-8.)

Petitioner, however, does not reference any statute that requires an explanation for the basis for the low-income or moderate-income housing designation. The housing element law only requires that the City specify "the number of units that can realistically be accommodated on that site and whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing, moderate-income housing, or above moderate-income housing" and demonstrate "how the number of units determined for that site...will be accommodated." (§ 65583.2(c), (c)(1).) The sites inventory indicates the total number of units for each site. (JR 229 ["Total Units" column].) By indicating the number of units that are designated as low-income or moderate-income housing, the City also indicates "whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing [or] moderate-income housing." (JR 229 ["Lower" and "Mod" columns].) While the City did not explain how the total number of units will be accommodated for the reasons stated above, the designation of housing as low-income or moderate-income is not deficient.

Nevertheless, it is not apparent from the sites inventory whether the City adjusted the numbers for low-income and moderate-income housing based on "typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction." (§ 65583.2(c)(2).) By multiplying the land area by the maximum residential density of 79.2 units per acre and designating all housing as low- or moderate-income housing, the City assumes that all units built on the site will be low-income or moderate-income housing. The City does not account for the possibility that only a certain percentage of the housing on the site will be designated for residents with low- or moderate-income. A revised housing element would need to contain an adjustment based on typical densities at similar affordability levels.

In sum, with respect to realistic development capacity, the housing element is deficient for the following reasons: (1) for conversions, the sites inventory calculates the total number of units based on a product of land area and the maximum residential density without accounting for the floor area of the building; (2) the sites

inventory does not contain any adjustments based on land use controls for new construction; (3) the housing element contains no analysis of the governmental constraints on the development of housing; and (4) the sites inventory does not contain any adjustments based on typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at similar affordability levels in the City.

2. Nonvacant Sites

For nonvacant sites, the housing element law imposes the following additional requirement:

> [T]he city or county shall specify the additional development potential for each site within the planning period and shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential. The methodology shall consider factors including the extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment to additional residential development, the city's or county's past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development, the current market demand for the existing use, an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development, development trends, market conditions, and regulatory or other incentives or standards to encourage additional residential development on these sites.

(§ 65583.2(g)(1).)

Petitioner argues that the City does not explain how its methodology relates to the sites it has included or excluded in the sites inventory. For underutilized nonvacant sites, respondent explains that it selected sites that were more likely to be redeveloped or converted based on evidence of a lack of investment in the property, such as a lack of maintenance or lack of recent upgrades and improvements; parcels with underutilized improvements; and parcels with existing commercial buildings that are higher than 3 stories but whose floor plan is conducive to residential conversion. (JR 202-03, 210-11.) Respondent also explains that existing uses do not constitute an impediment to additional residential development because the creation of the Overlay Zone creates opportunities for residential development; conversion from non-residential to residential use costs less than new construction; and high residential property values in the City create financial incentives for residential development. (JR 209-10.) However, respondent discusses its methodology for determining development potential generally, without engaging in any site-specific analysis.

Respondent contends that it need not engage in an analysis of the methodology of the development potential for each site. The Court disagrees. Section

65583.2(g)(1) states that, for nonvacant sites, "the city or county shall specify the additional development potential for each site within the planning period and shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential." Reading the subdivision as a whole, the City is required to provide an explanation of the methodology for each site in the sites inventory. Among the factors that the methodology must consider are "the current market demand for the existing use" and "an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development." (§ 65583.2(g)(1).) These factors necessarily relate to specific sites and cannot be discussed generally. Because the Legislature included these factors, the Legislature surely intended that the City provide "an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential" for each site.

Without a site-specific analysis, it is unclear how the methodology was applied. For example, as petitioner points out in the opening brief, the City purports to have excluded commercial buildings that contained medical uses and car dealerships from the sites inventory. (JR 210.) However, the sites inventory includes medical buildings and car dealerships. (*See, e.g.,* JR 229-30 [153 S. Doheny Dr., 239 S. La Cienega Blvd., 8833 W. Olympic Blvd., 8845 W. Olympic Blvd., 9134 W. Olympic Blvd.].) The City does not explain how the existing use does not serve as an impediment to residential development.

For the foregoing reasons, with respect to section 65583.2(g)(1), the housing element is deficient because the City did not provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential for each site, including a discussion of the factors probative of likelihood of redevelopment set forth in section 65583.2(g)(1).

Further, the sites inventory shows that the City is meeting all of its share of the need for lower-income housing through nonvacant sites. Accordingly, section 65583.2(g)(2), quoted below, is implicated:

> In addition to the analysis required in paragraph (1), when a city or county is relying on nonvacant sites described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) to accommodate 50 percent or more of its housing need for lower income households, the methodology used to determine additional development potential shall demonstrate that the existing use identified pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element. An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

(§ 65583.2(g)(2).)

For nonvacant sites, the "Field Notes/Existing Conditions & Analysis for Keeping/Removing" column in the sites inventory only indicates the existing use of the site and whether the site is designated for conversion or has conversion potential. (JR 229-34.) The City does not engage in any discussion of occupancy rates, lease terms, viability of the business operating at the sites. Nor does the City present any other discussion demonstrating that the existing use for each site "does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element." (§ 65583.2(g)(2).) Without any evidence concerning the existing use of each site, the existing use is presumed to impede additional residential development. (*Ibid.*)

Respondent maintains that Culver City and Gardena obtained HCD approval based on a chart similar to its sites inventory. However, unlike Beverly Hills, Gardena's sites inventory sets forth the existing use of each site and why the existing use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period. (Reply RJN Ex. B; cf. Chen Decl. Ex. B at 71 [listing criteria used in selection of sites].) With respect to Culver City, the sites inventory does not set forth the reason why the existing use is likely to be discontinued. (Chen Decl. Ex. A at Appendix B.) However, elsewhere in the housing element, Culver City discusses sites that present opportunities for development based on positive responses from property owners and developers. (Chen Decl. Ex. A at B-9 to B-10.) Unlike Beverly Hills, Culver City discussed how the existing use at certain sites would not impede residential development. Beverly Hills did not engage in any site-specific analysis concerning how the existing use would not impede additional residential development.

Respondent contends that the Court of Appeal in *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193 determined that no site-specific analysis concerning the methodology used to determine development potential and additional development factors is required. This is not quite accurate. In *Martinez*, the Court of Appeal found that section 65583.2(g)(1) "does not mandate the City 'specify the additional development potential for each [nonvacant] site within the planning period and ... provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential' *in the housing element itself*." (*Martinez*, 90 Cal.App.5th at 248-49, emphasis added.) While specification of the additional development potential for each site does not have to be part of the housing element, the City still must demonstrate the additional development potential for each site. In *Martinez*, for example, the City of Clovis provided evidence outside of the housing element to demonstrate the development potential of a nonvacant site. (*Id.* at 249-51.)

Here, there is no analysis of the additional development potential for each site listed in the sites inventory in the housing element or elsewhere. Further, the housing element does not contain findings based on substantial evidence that the existing uses of nonvacant sites are likely to be discontinued, as required by section 65583.2(g)(2).

In sum, with respect to nonvacant sites, the housing element is deficient for the following reasons: (1) the City did not provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential for each site in the sites inventory, including a discussion of the factors probative of likelihood of redevelopment set forth in section 65583.2(g)(1); and (2) the City fails to demonstrate with substantial evidence that the existing use for each site in the sites inventory does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element.

C. Specific Sites

Petitioner also contends that certain sites were improperly included in the sites inventory. (OB at 15:6-17:1.) Petitioner maintains that the City did not make the findings based on substantial evidence that are required to rebut the presumption under section 65583.2(g)(2) that the existing use will impede additional residential development. (Reply at 4:13-14.)

However, in contending that additional residential development is not possible on certain sites, petitioner relies on extra-record evidence. For example, for 55 North La Cienega, the sites inventory indicates that the property will have 70 low-income units. (JR 229.) However, petitioner presents a Planning Commission Report and meeting minutes to assert that the City's Planning Commission approved development on the site with only 11 units of very low-income housing. (Gelfand Decl. Exs. C at 1, D at 3-4.)

"[W]here the scope of review of factual findings is substantial evidence, review limited to the administrative record is appropriate because extra-record evidence is irrelevant to whether the agency's decision is supported by substantial evidence." (*Cinema West, LLC v. Baker* (2017) 13 Cal.App.5th 194, 208.) Petitioner cannot challenge the inclusion of sites in the inventory based on extra-record evidence. Ironically, petitioner would have the Court consider the propriety of certain sites based on extra-record evidence, but then bar respondent from presenting extra-record evidence to rebut petitioner's argument. (Reply at 4:18-5:13.)

With respect to sites which petitioner contends are unlikely to disappear based on their existing use (OB at 16:21-17:2; JR 1557-58), the Court already finds that respondent did not make findings based on substantial evidence that the existing use for each nonvacant site in the sites inventory is likely to be discontinued. The City must make such findings in revising the housing element.

## VI. Conclusion

The petition is GRANTED. Pursuant to Local Rule 3.231(n), petitioner shall prepare, serve, and ultimately file a proposed judgment and proposed writ of mandate.

Date: September 12, 2023

HON. CURTIS A. KIN

09/14/2023

CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP

CAL HDF

Dec 1, 2025

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**49 South Van Ness Avenue**
**San Francisco, CA 94103**

**Re: Housing Element Implementation**

**By email:** Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

**Cc:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") and Californians for Homeownership ("CFH") write in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm. We write to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Family Zoning Plan violate state law. Specifically:

1. The City's proposed rezonings will not produce sufficient new housing. This violates commitments the City made when it adopted its Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

2. The City's proposed rezonings add new constraints on housing production. This, again, violates commitments the City made in its Sixth Cycle Housing Element and independently violates the Housing Element Law.

3. The "Housing Choice - San Francisco" program seeks to exempt San Francisco from certain state housing laws. That is illegal.

**If the City does not correct these problems, CalHDF and CFH will challenge the City in court.** As a result of the lawsuit, the City would, potentially, fall out of compliance with the Housing Element Law and face exposure to the "builder's remedy." (See Gov. Code, § 65589.5,

subds. (d)(5), (d)(6).) CalHDF and CFH urge the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance.

## The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

"probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this

method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning. This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

Changes to the planned rezoning since the analysis was conducted have further reduced the amount of new housing that can be expected. The proposed rezoning – specifically, the "Housing Choice - San Francisco" program – has been modified to add new unit mix requirements (see pages 14-15 here) and historic preservation requirements (page 30). The Land Use Committee made these changes despite unambiguous evidence in the record that the changes would reduce new housing's feasibility and reduce the number of new units the rezoning can be expected to create. The problem, then, is *even greater* than what the City Economist's analysis shows.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based

on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF and CFH urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model, such as the City Economist's, shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

## The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

CalHDF and CFH also note that the HCSF program was amended in committee on November 17, 2025 to include additional constraints. The HCSF program now virtually excludes any site in a historic district (see page 30 here). The HCSF now also imposes additional unit mix requirements on new housing projects (see pages 14 and 15 here). With respect to the unit mix requirements, it is silly for San Francisco, a City defined by large, multi-bedroom homes, to require new housing to replicate the bulk of existing housing supply in its bedroom counts. If new housing proposals include fewer bedrooms per unit, on average, that is because San Francisco's existing housing stock is already dominated by multi-bedroom homes; it is natural that new housing will fill a niche that the current housing supply does not.

More importantly, the new unit mix requirements, as well as other new constraints on housing, pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.

## The Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program Cannot Exempt San Francisco from State Law

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

### Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. ( See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[3] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[3] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here and attached to this letter).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for a local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF and CFH point out that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[4] HCD's

[4] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF and CFH remind the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

## The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

## The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, CalHDF and CFH warn the City to take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) 115 Cal.App.5th 111 makes clear that in order to comply with

minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF and CFH therefore urge the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

Sincerely,

Matthew Gelfand
*Californians for Homeownership*

Dylan Casey
*CalHDF*

# Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES

**Report in Support of San Francisco Policy and Practice Review**

Written by:

Moira O'Neill (PI)
Vivek Adury
Eric Biber (Co-PI)
Deborah Le-An Tan
Laura Tepper
Ivy Wang

Prepared for the California Department of Housing and Community Development in partial fulfillment of contract #22-30-002.

Disclaimer: The statements and conclusions in this Report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Acknowledgments:

The following students supported building the entitlement dataset and related data cleaning and analysis for this research during the 2022-2023 academic year: Claire Ching, Riya Chopra, Ryan Denker, Olivia Anne Drew Grimes, Rachel Kinzer, Riley Layman, Lily Roberts, Jackson Smith, and Jenny Tsing. Also, Tim Dodson supported data collection related to determining project intake and notification dates.

## Table of Contents


***Executive Summary*** ..... ***6***

**Background: Why Study San Francisco?** ..... **6**

**Research Questions and Approach** ..... **7**

**Summary of Findings** ..... **9**

**SB 35 fixes planning review for eligible housing developments but is not a complete process fix.** ..... 10

**Unpredictable discretionary review processes create uncertainty and risk—even for code compliant development of any size in any location citywide.** ..... 12

**Timeframes for discretionary approvals increased.** ..... 12

**Local policy and practices are inconsistent with the goals of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act.** ..... 13

**Subjectivity and variability persist in the post-entitlement process.** ..... 15

**Stakeholders suggest local reforms must eliminate discretionary review on some housing or the city will not meet its RHNA or resolve long-standing inequities in land use.** ..... 15

**Conclusion** ..... **16**

***Introduction*** ..... ***17***

***Methods, Data, and Limitations*** ..... ***18***

**Overall Research Approach** ..... **18**

Ongoing Legal Research ..... 19

Our Interpretation of State Law and Definition of "Full Implementation" of State Law ..... 19

Unique Entitlement Dataset ..... 20

2014 - 2017 Observations ..... 21

2018 - 2021 Observations ..... 22

Primary Source Documents ..... 24

Regression Analysis ..... 25

In-Depth Interviews and Meetings and Review of Public Hearings ..... 25

Document Analysis ..... 26

Study and Data Limitations ..... 26

***Findings*** ..... ***28***

**San Francisco's local rules prevent full implementation of the goals and aims of state housing laws.** ..... **29**

**San Francisco Planning fully implemented SB 35, but SB 35 is not a complete process fix.** ..... 30

SB 35 processing timeframes are fast—whereas discretionary building permits typically take years. ..... 30

Developers report that SB 35 transformed planning approval pathways for affordable development. ..... 32

SB 35 does not resolve post-entitlement opposition through appeals. ..... 33

**More developments relied on State Density Bonus Law as compared with prior years, but stakeholders disagree about how easy it is to use the state law.** ..... 36

There was no consensus among developers about how easily developers could use State Density Bonus Law in San Francisco. ..... 38

Both developers and planners shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to helping developers manage requirements under local rules. ..... 38

**Local rules complicate application of the Housing Accountability Act.** ..... 41

**Local rules require entitlement processes begin before the application—and navigate multiple hurdles along the way to approval.** ..... 41

Application intake processes were inconsistent with the PSA but improved marginally over time. ..... 42

**Planning policy relies on exemptions to comply with CEQA, but local rules require additional studies.** ....43
**Risk of costly local appeals drives cautious environmental planning practices that limit the impact of the PSA.** ....46
**Continuances—possibly meant to avoid later challenges through administrative appeal—are frequent.** ....51
Publicly Initiated Exceptional DR occurs frequently and may foster negotiations outside of public hearings. ....51
Developers report that design guidelines are vague and invite subjective conditions of approval. ...53

**Cumulative and unique procedural hurdles create comparatively long entitlement timelines. .... 54**

**Stakeholders report that San Francisco's policy emphasizes project-level adjudication to achieve equitable development outcomes, when what the city needs to achieve equitable development outcomes is zoning and planning reform. .... 56**

**Planners and developers believe San Francisco needs procedural reform that addresses discretionary review, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors agree. .. 58**

**All stakeholder groups report persistent post-entitlement challenges. .... 61**

***Conclusion .... 62***

***Appendix A: Regression Supplement With Methods .... 66***

***Appendix B: Spatial Distribution of Developments .... 86***

***Appendix C: Analysis of Accuracy of Annual Progress Report Data on Entitlements and SB 35 Approvals .... 94***

Table 1: Timeframes to Planning Approvals Issued in 2018 - 2021 Selected Pathways10
Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years .... 21
Table 3: Summary of Total Approvals and Unit Counts Across Study Period .... 28
Table 4: 2018-2021 Approval Observations and Units by Affordability and Process .... 28
Table 5: Entitlement Timeframe by Approval Pathway 2018-2021 .... 31
Table 6: Median Project Size by Product Type and Approval Pathway .... 37
Table 7: Frequency of Use of Density Bonus (All Programs)[1] .... 40
Table 8: PPA to Application Timeframes .... 42
Table 9: Analysis of Application Status Notifications .... 43
Table 10: CEQA Compliance Pathways .... 45
Table 11: Total Time Spent on All CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 N=48 .... 50
Table 12: Total Time Spent on CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 for CALES Observations ... 50
Table 13: Total Cost CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 (N=48) .... 50
Table 14: Total Cost CEQA Appeals CALES Housing Only (N=19) .... 50
Table 15: Comparison of Entitlements Requiring CPEs Oakland-San Francisco 2014 - 2017 data .... 55
Table 16: Variation in Number of Approval Steps, by Process Categories, Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2018 - 2021 (N=111) .... 72
Table 17: All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 .... 75
Table 18: Regression Using 100 CPE Observations 2014 - 2017 .... 77

Table 19: Regression All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2014 - 2021 With Controls..... 79
Table 20: Regression Results, Dropping Approval Step Outliers (2014 - 2021 Data)... 80

Figure 1 Process Approval Pathway Timeframes..... 11
Figure 2 Comparison of Timeframes by Affordability Classification, All Years ..... 13
Figure 3 Distribution of Affordable Units by Development Type ..... 33
Figure 4 CEQA Milestone Timelines Categorical Exemptions Only (2018-2021)..... 47
Figure 5 CEQA Milestone Timelines Multiple Pathways (2018-2021) ..... 48
Figure 6 Regression 2018-2021 Observations (No Controls)..... 69
Figure 7 Ordinary Least Squares Regression 2014-2017 Observations (N=140)..... 76
Figure 8 Regression All Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2014-2021 (No Controls) ..... 78
Figure 9 Correlation Heat Map for 2018-2021 Regression Data (N=111) with Affordability, Neighborhood, and Process Characteristics..... 82
Figure 10 Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression (“No Controls” in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018-2021 ..... 83
Figure 11 Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression (“All Controls” in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018-2021..... 84

# Executive Summary

## Background: Why Study San Francisco?

San Francisco is the anchor city in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) region, with one of the highest Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) statewide. Complex processes that lead to delayed housing development approvals leave open questions about whether San Francisco's local legal regime will allow the city to meet this housing production target.

In 2016, authors O'Neill, Biber, and students launched the Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) at the University of California, Berkeley, to understand how cities, including San Francisco, design and apply local and state law to proposed developments of five or more units approved in 2014 - 2017. In an earlier report,[1] we found San Francisco's local regulatory regime comparatively prohibitive, risking exclusionary zoning despite explicit policies to promote inclusion and fair housing goals through inclusionary housing programs, rent stabilization, and tenant protections. Among the 28 jurisdictions we studied, San Francisco was among the cities with more land zoned for dense housing, although that zoning was not equitably distributed citywide. But most notable, among all our study cities, San Francisco was an *extreme* outlier in process requirements and timeframes to approval. The city had a median timeframe to entitlement of over two years for code compliant multi-family housing that benefited from streamlined environmental review.

San Francisco's median timeframe was not only longer than its neighbors, it was longer than timeframes in neighboring cities with purportedly more difficult local law. Berkeley, for example, has complex rules that require a use permit[2] for all new housing development, and yet the median timeframe to entitlement was four months shorter for comparable multi-family housing. Moreover, once we parsed out our data to explore how environmental review streamlining might impact timelines, we found that Berkeley's median timeframe dropped to less than 10 months for apartment buildings, whereas San Francisco's remained at 24 months for the *same type of housing*. San Francisco exemplified how cities can write and implement procedural rules in a manner that creates uncertainty of approval. Uncertainty creates risk, and risk influences what developers will propose and build, as well as which developers will consider developing within a city. During our research, affordable developers who worked in neighboring cities explained they could not work within San Francisco because entitlement was too uncertain and difficult.

California's legislature has passed nearly 100 laws relevant to housing policy since 2016.[3] These laws seek to spur housing production across all income levels and promote equitable housing outcomes—namely increased housing production in high opportunity locations. Many important changes to state housing law target subjectivity in discretionary processes, like

---

[1] We refer here to our Report to the California Air Resources Board in fulfillment of Contract #3900-19STC005. MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS (2022). We also cross reference prior publications.

[2] Project proponents apply for a use permit, often referred to as a conditional use permit, when local rules allow for certain uses subject to approval—but not as a matter of right under the local zoning.

[3] *See* Ben Metcalf, Managing Dir., UC Berkeley, Terner Ctr. for Hous. Innovation, Presentation at the California Joint Oversight Hearing with Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee: Housing Production: Recent Legislative Actions and Outcomes (Feb. 28, 2023), https://shou.senate.ca.gov/node/21.

planning review,[4] and work towards quickening approval processes, particularly for multi-family housing. New law and policy aim to accelerate housing production in high opportunity areas, inviting important questions about how well San Francisco has implemented these laws and whether they effectuate production, affordability, and equity. To answer these questions, we expanded and extended CALES to explore San Francisco's local land use regulation in more detail and identify specific roadblocks to dense multi-family housing. This report details our methods, presents findings, and discusses their implications for the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Policy and Practice Review.

## Research Questions and Approach

HCD asked (1) whether San Francisco is fully implementing key state housing laws, such as the Housing Accountability Act, the Housing Crisis Act, the Permit Streamlining Act, Senate Bill 35 (SB 35), and State Density Bonus Law; (2) whether local implementation is allowing these state laws to achieve their intended effect of promoting housing production and affordability; (3) what causes delay in the entitlement process and how the city's discretionary review process impacts overall project timelines and the housing approvals pipeline.

To answer these questions, we used a spiraling mixed methods research design that joins legal research and qualitative, quantitative, and spatial analyses to understand San Francisco's local regulatory environment. This design helped our study overcome some of the limitations of each method and allowed us to adapt our research approach to the specific needs of studying San Francisco.

HCD's questions one and two require us to interpret our data and provide findings based on our interpretation of what state law requires of localities.[5] For example, we interpret the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act as applicable to all multi-family housing approvals in San Francisco that do not require a local legislative action. We define "full implementation" of these state laws to mean that San Francisco both complies with state law, but also that local rules or planning practices do not effectively circumvent the purpose of the limitations imposed on cities by state law.

We built a unique and highly detailed dataset of 140 planning entitlements[6] of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017. We added 144 observations of entitlements and SB 35 approvals issued

---

[4] For a discussion of what characterizes a discretionary action, see Friends of Westwood, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 181 Cal. App. 3d 259, 269-74 (1987). When city employees can set standards and conditions for many aspects of a proposed building, the approval process is discretionary. For a definition of a ministerial process in California law, see Prentiss v. City of S. Pasadena, 15 Cal. App. 4th 85, 90, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641 (1993) (citing CAL. CODE REGS., tit.14, § 15268(b)(1) (2023)("'Ministerial' describes a governmental decision involving little or no personal judgment by the public official as to the wisdom or manner of carrying out the project. The public official merely applies the law to the facts as presented but uses no special discretion or judgment in reaching a decision. A ministerial decision involves only the use of fixed standards or objective measurements, and the public official cannot use personal, subjective judgment in deciding whether or how the project should be carried out.")). Importantly, ministerial decisions are exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

[5] We discuss this in the report; our analysis depends on some assumptions about what "full" implementation of state law would entail.

[6] We refer to "entitlement" as a process and "entitlement" as an observation of that process in the singular and plural throughout this report. Entitlement refers to the type of housing approval that a project proponent secures from the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or Board of Supervisors when

in 2018 - 2021 to this dataset.[7] Our approvals dataset captured detail on each application and approval step under local rules and state law (like the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA) and important project characteristics (like affordability, building size, and location). We gathered the detail for our dataset from source documents (application documents, planning staff reports, and motion and resolution documents) wherever possible. We analyzed our data using statistics and mapping.

We conducted in-depth interviews and used participant observation and primary document analysis to understand why San Francisco's approval process operates the way that it does. We analyzed more than 35 hours of confidential in-depth research interviews with 24 participants representing affordable and market-rate developers, former and current city personnel and staff that work on housing development, land use attorneys, and housing advocates.[8] We observed and analyzed notes and transcripts from another 33 meetings that HCD convened with approximately 146 stakeholders. Most were approximately one hour long. Twenty-five of the HCD-led meetings were very small, with one to three participants, in addition to O'Neill and one representative from HCD. The small meetings allowed participants to offer deep insights, much like research interviews. In all, we analyzed notes and transcripts from ~68 hours of research interviews and meetings with 14 individuals across the executive and legislative bodies within San Francisco, over 20 former and current planning staff, more than 60 development professionals (evenly split between affordable and market-rate developers), and 6 different housing advocacy groups. We analyzed materials to extract themes and looked for frequency of themes across stakeholder groups. We also cross-referenced written law, recordings from hearings, approval documents, and analyses from our entitlement data.

### Limitations of Research Approach and Analysis

Each method and data point has some limitations. For example, each observation in our approval dataset represents a potential housing or mixed-use development that developers believed had a high enough probability of success that they were willing to pursue entitlement in the first place. There are no project denials in the database to allow for quantitative analysis, but we do have limited data on a few denials we examined during data collection. Gathering data on project denials in a systematic way (for quantitative analysis) would demand substantially expanding the scope of the research project, which was not feasible given the research timeframe. Further, defining a project denial for data collection and analysis is more complex than defining an entitlement. A denial includes what the city reports as a denial but should also include projects that the city effectively "denied" (where a political body denied a specific entitlement, for example) even though the project remains pending within the city's public portal

---

the local law reviews a proposal to build housing through a discretionary process. Discretionary review is a legal concept that means the city can set standards and conditions for many aspects of a proposed building and the approval process is discretionary. An entitlement typically precedes the building permit process, and it is a process that involves planning department review of a proposal to build housing and potentially requires an approval from a local elected or appointed political body. A ministerial process involves a public official applying law to fact without discretion or subjective judgment. Often, building departments issue ministerial approvals. Uniquely, state law creates a ministerial process that also involves planning review—which we discuss at length in the full report.

[7] Corrected Annual Progress Reports helped us identify 11 observations late in our research process. We were able to code essential characteristics for these 11 observations to include them in our summary statistical analyses only.

[8] Eighteen participants sat for interviews in 2022 - 2023, and several participated in more than one interview. We also analyzed transcripts from six interviews across the same stakeholder groups in San Francisco (affordable developers, planners, market-rate developers, and community-based organization advocates) that O'Neill conducted in 2017, where comparisons with prior years was useful.

or in its annual reporting. For the purposes of research, a denial could also include a project from which a developer appears to voluntarily withdraw after the city determines that it will not approve the project or will impose conditions that render the project infeasible. There also may be no documentation to verify whether a project that appears to be pending has effectively been denied. In our work, however, where we come across developments that have advanced in the entitlement process but are ultimately denied, we do discuss those developments.

All interview participants volunteered, as did all participants in HCD-led meetings. Voluntary participation in interviews and research meetings increases selection bias and limits the generalizability of findings.[9] We increased the number of interviews in each stakeholder group and triangulated data and methods to augment the overall reliability of our findings from interviews where possible. Some topics do not allow for this, however. For example, developers may discuss why they are unwilling to apply for entitlement, but there is no other data to explore to understand what deters applications beyond what the interview participants shared.

## Summary of Findings

HCD asked whether the data indicates San Francisco has fully implemented state housing law intended to promote housing production and affordability. **All data generally indicates that the answer is no.**

San Francisco's local rules embed subjectivity and uncertainty into review processes that state law says should be objective, time constrained, and, in some cases, certain. The city's authority to apply discretionary review to any permit, and the ease with which project opponents can appeal planning approvals and permits (including post-entitlement permits) to the Board of Supervisors or Board of Appeals fosters planning practices that limit full implementation of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, and in some instances, SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law. Planning staff are concerned about whether planning review will survive scrutiny from local political bodies, not the courts. Planning staff anticipate local political bodies will ignore planning recommendations and extend review processes if that is what neighborhood-level politics demand. Planning practices reflect this assumption, and local policy reinforces it. Developers interpret this planning practice as requiring more than what the law "on paper" demands through negotiation outside of public hearings to satisfy neighborhood interests. Developers perceive all planning approvals as uncertain and risky, even if the proposed development conforms to all zoning and planning standards. Eight years of approvals data confirms these perceptions. The risk and uncertainty embedded into local law has driven some developers to leave the San Francisco market and has deterred other developers from entering the market entirely.

Below, we elaborate on what the data tells us about the direct effects of specific state housing laws on San Francisco's housing approval process, what all data tells us about San Francisco's implementation of different state laws, and the relationship between local rules, planning practices, and lengthy entitlement outcomes. The report that follows details each finding.

[9] Selection bias refers to research participants not being fully representative of the group to which they belong. This limits our ability to interpret what we hear as the perspectives of a particular stakeholder group, generally.

## SB 35 fixes planning review for eligible housing developments but is not a complete process fix.

Data shows San Francisco Planning diligently implemented SB 35. Approximately 36 professionals who work on affordable development unanimously reported that SB 35's ministerial process "fixed" planning review for affordable housing developments because the state law created certainty of planning approval where none existed previously. Stakeholder perceptions are borne out in the planning approval data. Table 1 shows that the median timeframe for planning approval for developments that applied only under SB 35 was ~3.4 months and could take up to eight months. In contrast, code compliant discretionary developments[10] requiring only a building permit had a median timeframe of two years and could take as many as four years.

*Table 1: Timeframes to Planning Approvals Issued in 2018 - 2021 Selected Pathways*

| Process Category | Timeframe (Months) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Minimum | **Median** | **Mean** | Maximum |
| SB 35 only (N=9)[1] | 0.89 | 3.42 | 4.24 | 7.62 |
| Discretionary building permit only (N=13) | 7.76 | 24.20 | 24.67 | 47.70 |

[1]This count does not include five applications that developers proposed as discretionary approvals, some before SB 35's enactment, that San Francisco later approved under SB 35.

Importantly, stakeholder interviews indicate SB 35 provided both affordable developers and planning staff relief from San Francisco's local rules. Data on how San Francisco Planning processed applications for development before SB 35 indicates Planning prioritized expediting 100% affordable developments.[11] Local law still limited how quickly planners could complete review for any development, including 100% affordable development that the city helped fund. In fact, the city entitled only five 100% affordable developments in 2014 – 2017, which would yield 567 units if built. The median timeframe to approval for these five 100% affordable developments was 15 months. In contrast, SB 35's ministerial process allowed San Francisco Planning to approve 14 100% affordable developments that would yield 1,663 affordable units if built. The median timeframe for the SB 35 100% affordable developments was less than 7.5 months, inclusive of developments that began as discretionary developments and later applied for SB 35 eligibility review. The median timeframe for 100% affordable housing developments that only applied for approval under SB 35 was less than three months. Most SB 35 developments also used State Density Bonus Law, so they were, on average, larger as compared with another three discretionary 100% affordable developments San Francisco approved in 2018 – 2021, or the five entitled in 2014 - 2017.

However, SB 35's effects are limited to planning review. All stakeholders still describe the post-entitlement approval process as subjective, lacking standardization and sufficient oversight.

[10] Code compliant discretionary development means proposed housing development that conforms to all zoning and only requires a building permit. San Francisco law provides that this development is subject to discretionary review.

[11] Interviews at that time indicated internal work and analysis to expedite affordable development, but median timeframes for 100% affordable developments were still 15 months.

Stakeholders share that the post-entitlement permitting process depends entirely on the professional assigned to the project, not the project scope itself. Stakeholders report that subjectivity in the post-entitlement process can trigger additional planning review even after a project has moved to the Department of Building Inspection. Because SB 35 is limited to the planning review stage, the state law has no effect on these post-entitlement procedural issues. Developers share that because San Francisco's law offers opportunities for project opponents to challenge, or appeal, permits after entitlement, including demolition permits, SB 35 eligible projects are susceptible to process challenges after planning review as well.[12]

SB 35 also does not represent a complete fix for San Francisco's procedural challenges. SB 35 applies to qualifying projects so long as San Francisco keeps failing to meet its housing production targets. But missing housing production targets is not San Francisco's goal. **Still, San Francisco's implementation of SB 35 signals what is possible with a ministerial process while also spotlighting San Francisco's problematic existing discretionary review.**

*Figure 1: Process Approval Pathway Timeframes*




Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

[12] The recent appeal of demolition permits for an SB 35 development located at 2550 Irving demonstrates this point.

## Unpredictable discretionary review processes create uncertainty and risk—even for code compliant development of any size in any location citywide.

All permits in San Francisco are discretionary under local law unless preempted by state law[13] (like SB 35). Stakeholders describe the discretionary housing approval process in San Francisco as risky and unpredictable. Stakeholders report approval is uncertain even if the proposal conforms to all zoning and planning requirements. When we use different statistical methods to analyze the housing approval data, we also find that **no type of housing development is easy to entitle in San Francisco**. Even a smaller development that conforms to zoning and planning requirements faces unpredictable timeframes. When we analyze the approvals data to explore relationships between specific approval requirements and timeframes, we discover that there are factors—like affordability classification, project size, and location—outside of what zoning and planning standards require that influence timeframes. This suggests that these other factors might play a substantial role in whether and how a project gets entitled, even when a project conforms to all planning standards and zoning.

## Timeframes for discretionary approvals increased.

Our 2018 - 2021 approvals data indicates that entitlement timeframes have increased as compared to the prior four years. The median timeframe for discretionary approvals of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017 was 27 months. In 2018 - 2021, the median timeframe for the same climbed to 34 months—more than a 25% increase. Figure 2 shows that in both study periods, 100% affordable development moved comparatively faster: 100% affordable development requiring discretionary review had median approval timeframes of ~15 months in 2014 - 2017 and ~20 months in 2018 – 2021. Both periods show that the city can quicken the process, to some degree, for affordable development. Interview data from 2017 and 2022 - 2023 indicate that planning staff have been committed to expediting affordable development.

[13] The Municipal Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 26(a) provides that San Francisco's departments may "take into consideration the effects of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents . . . [and to] exercise its [or their] sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked." SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., BUS. & TAX REGS. CODE § 26(a) (2019). San Francisco Planning's website states that the city interprets this part of the Municipal Code as granting the Planning Commission discretionary authority over all building permits, including permits not otherwise discretionary under zoning and planning requirements. *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).

*Figure 2: Comparison of Timeframes by Affordability Classification, All Years*




Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

## Local policy and practices are inconsistent with the goals of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act.

Stakeholders report that San Francisco's local rules and politics create planning practices that are inconsistent with state housing laws which aim to quicken planning review and reduce subjectivity. Approvals data suggests these stakeholders are correct.

**First, the data the city makes publicly available on project applications shows San Francisco systematically failed to meet PSA notification deadlines for discretionary approvals issued in 2018 - 2021**. Planning recorded more information on application notices in its public portal for applications filed after January 1, 2018, as compared to prior years, indicating that San Francisco Planning is doing more to track and disclose project intake. Still, the city's data shows the city routinely did not meet PSA deadlines. Also, up until July 2023, local policy required the entitlement process for most dense development to begin with a mandatory Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) process that added, on average, a year to the application process.

**Second, local rules drive the city's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which extends timelines**. Local rules that allow for easy administrative appeals and require appeal of CEQA determinations to follow entitlement[14] push environmental planners to make CEQA determinations at the close of the entitlement process. This practice limits the PSA's effect on overall approval timeframes.[15] Also, the state's CEQA guidelines do not require San Francisco Planning to incorporate wind and shadow studies into compliance pathways for exempt developments, but local law does. These supplemental studies add time

[14] The Board of Supervisors provides an advisory that explains that Section 31.16 of its Administrative Code requires that the Board will hear an appeal after the final approval action. *See* S.F. BD. OF SUPERVISORS, APPEAL FILING TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) EXEMPTION DETERMINATIONS APPEAL (Aug. 28, 2023), https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/CEQA_Exemption_Determinations_Appeal_Info_Sheet.pdf.

[15] We interpret California Government Code § 65690(a) as imposing limits on the time to approval under the PSA only after a city makes CEQA determinations. *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65690(a) (West 2023).

and cost to environmental review, and sometimes provide a basis for local administrative appeals.[16]

**Third, and relatedly, administrative appeals not only delay entitlement for specific projects that face appeal, administrative appeals also influence planning practices at a systems level.** Most stakeholders (across groups) perceive that San Francisco's process risks inserting the Board of Supervisors into any approval pathway through an appeal. This process nurtures risk averse planning practices at all stages which derail other local and state policy that aims to quicken review. Data also shows that appeals increase the workload for planners already juggling immense workloads, which in turn impacts the pace of review for other development proposals. For example, **an administrative appeal of just one entitlement in our dataset required 374 additional staff hours and $52,204 to prepare the appeal—even though the appeal was withdrawn**. Notably, nearly all the planners we interviewed or met with are more apprehensive of the Board of Supervisors than potential litigants.

**Fourth, stakeholders report frequent continuances and multiple hearings for non-CEQA approvals, which they say also allows for changes to proposed development outside of formal hearings.** San Francisco's publicly accessible data on hearing dates is incomplete for about half of our 2018 – 2021 observations. Still, we found that at least 22% of all 2018 – 2021 quasi-adjudicative entitlements had multiple continuances or hearings for a single step.[17] Some observations have remarkably high rates of continuances and hearings. One project, for example, had nine continuances for a joined Large Project Authorization and Density Bonus approval step.

**Fifth, several stakeholder groups report that local policy allows frivolous and meritless challenges with ease (evidenced by withdrawn or denied appeals or withdrawn or denied requests for exceptional discretionary review)[18] and with little to no cost to project opponents, yet significant costs to planning staff and developers**. Project proponents see increased costs because of the delays and uncertainty that these processes create. The processes also impact the workflow of Planning Department staff, which slows down planning review. For example, data shows that when project opponents request exceptional discretionary review, planners can expect to work several days and sometimes weeks preparing for a hearing on a project with which they already completed review. This requires shuffling work priorities. Developers report that rules that make it easy to challenge imminent planning approvals foster an opaque practice of negotiation outside of formal hearings which risks imposition of subjective conditions of approval. The approvals data show at least 14% of entitlements (across both study periods—or eight years) faced administrative appeals that were usually withdrawn or denied.[19]

---

[16] We note here that San Francisco's public portal only provides access to shadow studies, although many stakeholders including planners stated that wind studies are common.

[17] This includes entitlements that only required a planning department or zoning administrator review. If we take out those entitlements that did not require a hearing in front of the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors under planning and zoning law, the rate is at least 30%.

[18] Exceptional discretionary review refers to a local rule that allows project opponents to request the Planning Commission exercise discretionary review for an approval that did not otherwise require the Planning Commission's involvement. This request necessitates a hearing, at which time the Planning Commission then determines if it will exercise discretionary review because of exceptional and extraordinary circumstances which could lead to modifying the conditions of approval. More detail on this local process is in the full report. We refer to this as "exceptional discretionary review" hereafter.

[19] Administrative appeal data for 2018 - 2021 depends on internal tracking and self-reported data and is not systematically available on the city's public portal. It is possible that the rate of administrative appeal could be higher.

Also, at least 20% of discretionary building permits in study years received a request for exceptional discretionary review.

## Subjectivity and variability persist in the post-entitlement process.

All stakeholders experienced with development in San Francisco shared that the permitting process lacks standardization or uniformity in how the process unfolds. Outcomes, in terms of processing time, are contingent on who is assigned to the development rather than on the form of the development. This variability slows, and sometimes derails, production. Stakeholders describe building permit processes as inefficient and subjective, triggering planning review again even after entitlement. There is also notable difference in the way all stakeholders describe Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) staff. Stakeholders blame local approval bodies for overly cautious planning practices. In contrast, stakeholders complain of too little oversight or management of DBI staff, and too few performance standards, as influencing permitting practices.

## Stakeholders suggest local reforms must eliminate discretionary review on some housing or the city will not meet its RHNA or resolve long-standing inequities in land use.

Importantly, planners, developers, and many housing advocates welcomed the state's intervention into local discretion through SB 35. Though planners expressed a need for more technical support from the state when state law augments local planning review, planners agreed with developers that the state ministerial process fixed planning review for most 100% affordable development and offered that a ministerial process could do the same for other housing projects.

Stakeholder groups also shared that reforms to expedite and simplify planning review while retaining discretion will fail to fix process problems in San Francisco. Statistical analysis of approvals data suggests these stakeholders are correct. Planning review of code compliant development can take years. This is true, even though our timeline calculations do not capture the frequency of developments subject to discretionary review being punted back to Planning *after* entitlement for further additional review, because San Francisco's public data portal does not allow for systematic analysis of this problem. Regression analysis suggests that reducing process steps while maintaining discretionary review is unlikely to resolve San Francisco's production challenges.[20]

**Stakeholders shared that rezoning must be coupled with procedural reform that provides a local ministerial process to address production challenges *and* equity**. Planners, developers, and some housing advocates perceive current reform efforts as "tinkering" with the zoning and planning code, when what they believe is needed is procedural overhaul and equitable upzoning. Stakeholders characterize San Francisco's existing regulation as reflecting historical and current power imbalances across neighborhoods. Stakeholders caution that current density and use controls that limit housing development in more affluent neighborhoods reflect existing neighborhood power over planning and political bodies. Also, the dominance of project-level adversarial politics reflects that some communities can only access power over land use by blocking development at public hearings. When affluent neighborhoods are rezoned, stakeholders caution that neighborhood power and influence over planning and

[20] Figure 8 illustrates. For a full discussion of regression analysis using the 2014 - 2021 data, see Appendix A.

political bodies will not necessarily disappear. Without a ministerial process for at least some development, stakeholders caution that rezoning will simply catalyze more project-by-project adjudication and administrative appeals as affluent communities block more equitable distribution of dense housing development through existing process tools. If what stakeholders forecast is correct—and the data suggests that they are—then existing timelines to approval likely underestimate future approval timeframes in higher opportunity neighborhoods that the city is in the process of upzoning or proposing to upzone.

Planners, developers, and advocates share that these local rules requiring reform are values-driven. These rules reflect a widespread assumption that more process supports meaningful community engagement and sharing of power over land use which, together, help address structural inequities in the built environment. Several stakeholder groups caution that these assumptions are faulty. San Francisco's process fosters project-level political fights that result in high-risk entitlement processes without altering longstanding inequities in planning standards and zoning. Planners, in particular, share that what San Francisco needed, and still needs, is deep engagement at the policy, planning, and zoning stages to hash out what zoning and planning standards should be, as well as simplified and ministerial approval for development at the project level that serves the city's housing policy goals. Planners and developers caution that as process has gotten worse in recent years, fewer developers can navigate the risk of developing in San Francisco, and this poses major challenges to San Francisco's ability to meet its production targets. During meetings with HCD, some Commissioners and Supervisors called out this local history and the problems of process in San Francisco, seemingly aligned with the perspectives of planners, affordable developers, and housing advocates. At the same time, meetings with both Commissioners and Supervisors also revealed clear disagreement within political bodies on both the source of San Francisco's housing problems and the solution. At least some Supervisors are skeptical that increasing anything other than affordable housing production could tackle the city's housing challenges. Some Commissioners and Supervisors also expressed concern about how State Density Bonus Law and SB 35 alter the urban form, even as they want more affordability. And at least some Supervisors perceived affordability to be welcome citywide, whereas planners and affordable developers say that this is not true.

## Conclusion

San Francisco's planning practice and process problems spring from local law that applies discretionary review to any permit and offers repeated opportunities to challenge project approvals after an already complex and lengthy planning review process. These rules incentivize risk averse planning practices to avoid disruptions to a busy workflow and public scrutiny from political bodies. Risk averse planning practices, in turn, limit full implementation of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, and in some instances, State Density Bonus Law. Local rules also limit the effects of SB 35, as affordable developers face post-entitlement appeals. Still, the direct effects of state ministerial review highlight what is possible in terms of resolving San Francisco's process issues. Planners, developers, and housing advocates suggest achievement of the city's equity goals requires a local ministerial process coupled with equitable upzoning. What is also apparent, however, is that reforming zoning and entitlement will be insufficient to attain production targets. The city has major challenges with post-entitlement processes—some of which are related, again, to local rules, and some of which are related to variability and subjectivity in permitting processes, staffing, and lack of inter-agency coordination.

# Introduction

In 2016, we launched the Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) at UC Berkeley. CALES explores how communities design and apply land use law to proposals to build dense housing. We used a 2015 California Legislative Analyst's Office report that identified the metro areas with the highest housing costs in the state and where demand has outpaced supply[21] to select our first group of study cities and regions. San Francisco was at the top of the list, and we began our work by studying San Francisco and four neighboring cities.[22] We eventually grew the study to include 28 jurisdictions in seven metropolitan regions across the state.

What we found was that San Francisco zoned comparatively more land for dense housing than nearly every other city we studied across the state. Indeed, San Francisco was one of only *two* cities studied that zoned more than a third of its zoned land for all income levels.[23] Zoning land for dense multi-family housing is a necessary though insufficient condition to achieving affordability and inclusion. California's fair share housing law is premised on this concept.[24]

Despite San Francisco zoning more land for dense housing than most cities studied, we found that San Francisco's local regulatory regime was comparatively prohibitive and risked exclusion. Even though the city has explicit local policy to promote inclusion and fair housing goals through inclusionary housing programs, rent stabilization, and tenant protections, our comparative analysis categorized San Francisco as "prohibitive" due to its complex procedural maze and application of laws. Among the 28 jurisdictions studied, San Francisco was unique in that it made all development discretionary. No other city we studied made all building permits (typically issued post-entitlement) discretionary; most used aesthetic regulation or design or site plan review as the blanket discretionary hook during entitlement. A few of our study cities required use permits for all multi-family housing development. But all the other approaches we found existed in the planning code and zoning regulations. No other city studied made building permits discretionary through some other area of local law.

San Francisco was also an extreme outlier in terms of timeframes to entitlement—with median timeframes of over two years, even for housing developments that met all zoning requirements and planning standards. These lengthy timeframes eclipsed the other study cities' timeframes by many months. These timelines also exceeded planner perceptions of "average" entitlement timeframes in communities nationwide. We found that only 5% of the 140 project observations in our 2014 - 2017 dataset from San Francisco achieved entitlement in 12 months or less.

We wrote that San Francisco's land use regime exemplifies how cities can zone land for dense multi-family housing and write and implement procedural rules to create delay and uncertainty of approval. Delay creates cost. Uncertainty creates risk. Increased development costs and risk influences which developers will build within a place, and what those developers will build. In that prior research, interview data and 2014 - 2017 approvals data suggested San Francisco's local regulatory regime burdened affordable development—even if the city prioritized affordable

---

[21] CHAS ALAMO ET AL., LEGIS. ANALYST'S OFF., CALIFORNIA'S HIGH HOUSING COSTS: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES (2015), https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.aspx.
[22] We refer here to our Report to the California Air Resources Board in fulfillment of Contract #3900-19STC005. MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS (2022).
[23] *Id.*
[24] *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65583.2 (West 2023).

development—and likely squeezed out possibilities for middle income housing development entirely. We found that San Francisco's local law facilitated most 2014 - 2017 entitlement being sited in formerly industrial locations or neighborhoods that had multi-family zoning in place for decades. What we concluded was that San Francisco was the most sophisticated of the cities we studied in how its local law effectively blocked dense housing development through complex procedural hurdles rather than traditional density and use constraints.

California's legislature has passed nearly 100 laws relevant to housing policy since 2016[25] to spur housing production across all income levels and promote equitable housing outcomes. Many important changes target subjectivity in planning review and aim to quicken planning review, particularly for multi-family housing. There is also new law and policy to accelerate equitable housing outcomes, in terms of increased production in high opportunity locations.

More recent legislative reforms invite important questions about how well San Francisco has implemented these state housing laws intended to promote housing production, affordability, and equity. To explore these questions, we expanded and extended our Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) to better understand San Francisco's local land use regulatory regime and identify roadblocks to all multi-family housing development approvals that would yield five or more units. This report details our methods, presents findings, and discusses their implications for the California Department of Housing and Community Developments' (HCD) Policy and Practice Review.

# Methods, Data, and Limitations

HCD asked:

1) At the local level, are state housing laws (including the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, Permit Streamlining Act, State Density Bonus Law, SB 35, and Housing Element Law) intended to promote housing production and affordability being fully implemented, and are they achieving their intended effect?
2) What are the causes of delay in San Francisco's entitlement process?
3) To what extent do discretionary review processes impact overall project timelines and the housing approvals pipeline?

## Overall Research Approach

We use a spiraling mixed methods research design that joins legal research and qualitative, quantitative, and spatial analyses to understand San Francisco's local regulatory environment and answer the research questions. A spiraling research design is iterative and allows us to reexamine theoretical assumptions and methodological choices throughout the research process. This iterative research approach is sensitive to local conditions and research needs that are sometimes difficult to discover at the beginning of a research process. This approach involves producing analysis at multiple points in the study to allow for a feedback loop with both HCD and San Francisco while also informing our own theoretical assumptions about which law, policy, or planning practice factors support or obstruct housing development. This approach also means we do not rely exclusively on qualitative, quantitative, or spatial analysis to answer any

[25] *See* Ben Metcalf, Managing Dir., UC Berkeley, Terner Ctr. for Hous. Innovation, Presentation at the California Joint Oversight Hearing with Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee: Housing Production: Recent Legislative Actions and Outcomes (Feb. 28, 2023), https://shou.senate.ca.gov/node/21.

research question. We use qualitative data (interviews) to understand our quantitative and spatial analysis (using our entitlement dataset) and vice versa.

### Ongoing Legal Research

We completed initial legal research into San Francisco's planning and zoning through CALES in 2016. We updated that legal research in 2018 and 2019, and then again in 2021 to understand changes to local planning review processes (for example, the elimination of the pre-application Environmental Evaluation process in 2018) and the impact of state housing laws (including changes to Density Bonus Law, Accessory Dwelling Unit Law, Senate Bill 330, SB 35, and amendments to the Housing Accountability Act), wherever changes are codified or provided for in policy documents. The legal and planning code summary informs our interview questions and guides our current data collection process. In the scope of this work, we updated our review of local law with relevant trial court and appellate court opinions.

### Our Interpretation of State Law and Definition of "Full Implementation" of State Law

Answering the first research question requires us to explore whether San Francisco's policy and practices comply with state law and whether San Francisco's local policy or practices prevent specific state laws from achieving their intended effect. This requires us, first, to interpret state law and define what it means for a locality to fully implement each law for the purposes of this research. How we define "full implementation" in the research questions also informs our methods of analysis. We list our understanding of the applicability of specific state laws, their aims, and our definition of "full implementation" here.

We interpret the PSA, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act as applicable to *all* discretionary approvals, or entitlements, in San Francisco that do not require local legislative action. We read provisions within San Francisco's Planning Code that allow for and anticipate that the Planning Commission will issue a waiver or exception from any planning standards or zoning *without* local legislative action as adjudicative and within the purview of these state laws.

We interpret the goal of the PSA as seeking to "expedite decisions" on qualifying development projects[26] by imposing time limits on application processing and approval decisions. We also interpret the Permit Streamlining Act as imposing limits on the time to approval under the Permit Streamlining Act only after a city makes CEQA determinations.[27] If our data shows that a local policy or practice prevents the Permit Streamlining from imposing those time limits, we conclude that the local policy or practice blocks the full implementation of the PSA, even if the data does not show San Francisco violated an express provision of the PSA.

We interpret that the goal of the Housing Accountability Act is to increase housing production by limiting the ability of cities to outright deny, reduce the density of, or render infeasible a development that complies with objective development standards. We interpret the Housing Accountability Act to prohibit these actions unless a locality provides written findings that the proposed development would have an unavoidable and impossible to mitigate adverse impact on public health or safety.[28] Relatedly, we interpret the 2017 amendments to the Housing Accountability Act, found in Assembly Bill 1515, as modifying the Housing Accountability Act's "reasonable person" standard for determining compliance with land use regulations[29] in favor of

[26] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65921 (West 2023).
[27] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65950 (West 2023).
[28] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65589.5 (West 2023).
[29] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65589.5(f)(4) (West 2023).

approving qualifying development. We read the law consistent with how the First District Court of Appeal read the law.[30] We also interpret the "deemed to comply" provision of the Housing Accountability Act consistent with this same appellate court opinion.[31] We interpret this state law as requiring a city to send a project applicant timely written notice and an explanation of non-compliance if a city determines a proposed housing development is inconsistent with applicable standards.

We use descriptive statistics and interviews to explore whether San Francisco may have imposed conditions that lead to a reduced density (between application and entitlement), or subjective standards (conditions that render the development infeasible), or otherwise effectively denied a proposal to develop housing that a reasonable person would conclude is compliant with land use regulations under the Housing Accountability Act. Where our data indicates that the city may have imposed subjective standards, conditions that reduce density, or conditions that may render developments infeasible, we describe this as a failure to fully implement the Housing Accountability Act. We do *not* conclude whether San Francisco violated an express provision the Housing Accountability Act because of the limitations of our data. We gather and analyze documents that are readily available through the city's parcel information map public portal—but we cannot confirm that the city did not issue a notice of non-compliance with applicable standards *or* did not prepare findings, because the documents are not readily available on the public portal. We cannot interpret the absence of those documents on the city's public portal as meaning that those documents do not exist, ergo, San Francisco did not comply with state law.[32]

We also interpret one goal of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, enacted in October 2019,[33] to be to curb delays associated with hearings, continuances, and meetings.[34] Where we identify entitlements with multiple hearings and more than five hearings, we describe as inconsistent with this law or that the city is not fully implementing the law. We do not determine whether the city is systematically violating the express prohibition on number of hearings, largely because of the data challenges surrounding hearings as discussed in the body of this report.

### Unique Entitlement Dataset

The Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) dataset is a uniquely detailed dataset on how entitlements issued in select years navigated their approval pathway. Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years details observations per study year.

---

[30] We refer here to the opinion in Cal. Renters Legal Advoc. & Educ. Fund v. City of San Mateo, 68 Cal. App. 5th 820, 845 (2021) ("Subdivision (f)(4) is intentionally deferential to housing development.").
[31] *Id.* at 831 (a "project is deemed to comply if 'substantial evidence . . . would allow a reasonable person to conclude' that it does").
[32] We do recommend, however, that San Francisco make those documents publicly available if they exist.
[33] We refer here to the passage of Senate Bill 330, approved by the Governor on October 9, 2019. S.B. 330, 2019-2020 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2019).
[34] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65905.5 (West 2023).

*Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years*

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019* | 2020 | 2021 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Projects | 24 | 23 | 55 | 38 | 36 | 42 | 25 | 41 |
| Units | 2,470 | 2,069 | 6,371 | 3,359 | 2,824 | 2,807 | 2,839 | 2,869 |

*We included one SB 35 observation without an eligibility determination date in 2019 based on the date of the building permit.

### 2014 - 2017 Observations

The 2014 - 2017 dataset does not include Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approvals but does include litigation-related data.[35] We do not rely on San Francisco's reporting on entitlement and permitting. Rather, we build our dataset from source documents including application documents, planning staff reports, motion and resolution documents, and legal pleadings where relevant, and construct our own code book. Importantly, in addition to our typical quality control measures, San Francisco uniquely provided us an opportunity to review our 2014 - 2017 dataset with the San Francisco Planning Department's Environmental Review team in 2018 following our first working paper.

Using San Francisco's online Property Information Map system (PIM), we augmented the 2014 - 2017 entitlement data in this study by:

1) Collecting additional hearing, correspondence, and approval data on the PPA and Environmental Evaluation Application processes, where available;
2) Collecting in-depth information on the nine observations where parties applied for exceptional Discretionary Review (DR) under San Francisco's Business and Tax Code, including all available data on the requests, hearings, and the Planning Commission's actions;
3) Confirming if and how market-rate developments satisfied San Francisco's inclusionary zoning (IZ) ordinance by reviewing our data and supporting documents (there are 10 market-rate developments in our dataset where we cannot confirm how the projects satisfied the IZ requirement);
4) Supplementing our search for "determined to be complete" dates issued by the Planning Department (there are none for all 140 observations) with a second search through San Francisco's Property Information Map (PIM)[36] for correspondence regarding incomplete applications; and
5) Augmenting existing CEQA-related coding with any available data on Wind, Shadow, and Transportation Demand Management studies for each observation in the 2014 - 2017 dataset.

[35] We detail how we collected and quality checked the 2014 - 2017 entitlement data we reference in the Report to the California Air Resources Board (CARB Report). MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS 36-43 (2022).
[36] PIM refers to San Francisco's public portal that provides comprehensive access to numerous records associated with parcels. *San Francisco Property Information Map*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/ (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

The Permit Streamlining Act provides planning departments should determine whether an application to develop housing is complete within 30 days of receipt or the application will be deemed complete.[37] We found no publicly available data that documents that San Francisco's planners made completeness determinations within 30 days of application for any entitlement of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017. [38]

We explored the data to see if we could determine "deemed complete" dates as well. For discretionary building permit applications, we could almost always locate the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) applications (where applicable) but could not always find Project Applications consistently logged. The Notice of Building Permit Application, however, references the application date (though we cannot confirm the date against a source document). For other approval applications that require only one local approval—like a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA)—we can locate the PPA documents, but we can only sometimes locate applications for those discrete approvals with date stamps of application receipt by the Planning Department.

We also cannot determine from the documents on PIM when planning review began for entitlements issued in 2014 - 2017. For projects that fall under the Permit Streamlining Act, this means that it is not possible to confirm compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act even if the Planning Department staff did not make completeness determinations. For example, we found a few instances of Planning Department correspondence that lists what an application for a discretionary approval (like a CUA) is missing, and states that review has begun and that time limits do not begin until after the project proponent submits the required materials—but the letter does not provide *when* planning review began. These letters are dated many months after the application date.[39] The date of the letter suggests non-compliance with the PSA, but the language is vague. Also, although PIM links users to a portal that provides some building permit data (permit number, description, and date), there is little to no supporting documentation available.

### 2018 - 2021 Observations

We first modified the data collection template to account for important changes in state law and to track source documents closely. We have variables to identify the source of data that we used to determine the timeframe, approval, and hearing values. Adding data source variables allows us to code for whether we were able to identify an approval detail or event based on the original document (primary source) or an entry in San Francisco's portal (secondary or self-reported source). We also constructed new variables to explore:

- How many public hearings (including continuances) to which a project was subjected.
- The approval body required of a developer or property owner before issuing an approval.
- Changes to project characteristics (in terms of the number of units proposed, or types of units proposed) throughout the entitlement process.
- How developments that qualified for state ministerial approvals (such as SB 35) navigated the approval process.

---

[37] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65920 (West 2023).

[38] During our prior research in San Francisco, we did not request this information through a Public Records Act request. We did confirm in meetings with San Francisco personnel that at that time, Planning did not track the relevant information.

[39] For example, using one of our CUA observations to illustrate, we can find the application (with the submission date) and the Planning Department's notice that details what is missing, and that review is underway. The time lag between the two is about 10 months and does provide when planning review began.

Consistent with prior coding, we also always code for “other approvals” we could not anticipate from legal research and review of San Francisco’s local planning and zoning ordinances. In 2018 - 2021 data, examples include approvals like those requiring sidewalk legislation to allow a development to meet other code requirements. We also continuously add variables to augment the dataset to answer the research questions above.

We built our potential observation list to collect data from multiple sources. We referenced Annual Progress Report (APR) data to identify all reported entitlements or ADU or SB 35 approvals that would yield five or more new residential units if built. The APR listed duplicates. We cleaned for duplicates as we only wanted to examine unique projects in the APR. Once we had unique reported entitlements, we ran a match within our own 2014 - 2017 dataset. We ran a fuzzy-join text matching algorithm[40] between unique entitlements in the APR with our 2014 - 2017 dataset. We found six APR unique projects that overlapped with observations in our 2014 - 2017 data (which we had already cleaned and confirmed involved entitlements in those years). We do not include those in our 2018 - 2021 dataset.[41] We incorporated the remainder of APR entitlements into our data collection strategy. We then reviewed CEQA-related approvals in San Francisco's PIM portal and Planning Commission agendas using San Francisco’s public database of environmental review notices of determinations and exemptions.[42] We identified another group of observations (developments that appeared potentially approved in 2018 - 2021) to incorporate into our data collection strategy. Our 2018 - 2021 data includes 16 SB 35 observations and 17 discretionary ADUs. We provide more detail on the accuracy of APR data in Appendix C.

In all, a team of trained students collected data on 196 potential observations of entitlement/approvals issued in 2018 - 2021 after constructing a project list from the APR, cross-referencing environmental review determinations, and any other materials that listed out SB 35 project approvals. After preliminary data collection we determined 144 observations belonged in our study for analysis of entitlements and SB 35 approvals issued in 2018 - 2021. We excluded pending entitlements, entitlements outside of our study years, and Development Agreements associated with a major phased development where no phase or building had yet secured its final entitlement. We completed a full quality check of 133 of our 2018 - 2021 observations. The quality check process involved checking each coded value we recorded in the database twice against the source document or the PIM entry if no source document was available. Where there was an ambiguity or confusion about what the coded value should be, O’Neill reviewed the value and the source material to make a final coding decision.

We completed a partial quality check for 11 observations we gathered late in our data collection process, after referencing amended Annual Progress Reports, to allow for reliable summary statistics, including regression analysis, and all spatial analysis. We exclude these 11 observations from our analysis of frequency of continuances, changes in proposed density from

---

[40] A fuzzy join is a joining method that is used for merging two datasets that are not perfectly matched. The reason we ran a fuzzy join is that there may be differences in how an address was written in the APR and our original dataset. A fuzzy join allows us to match projects that may have similar but not identical addresses in the APR and the CALES dataset.

[41] We would have to first confirm with San Francisco Planning whether these six potential observations were new entitlements and not modifications before including them in our dataset.

[42] *Environmental Review Documents*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

application to approval, project intake processes, inclusionary housing program compliance pathway, and frequency of additional studies during environmental review.

### Primary Source Documents

Whenever possible, we relied on primary source documents; San Francisco does not make all primary source documents readily available. For example, calculating timeframes to entitlement for discretionary observations requires tracking the earliest required application date. Prior to discontinuing the PPA requirement in July 2023, San Francisco required project proponents submit a PPA for specific types of development before submitting a project application. We have 87 observations in our 2018 - 2021 dataset that would have required a PPA application. We were able to locate the signed and dated PPA application document to determine the first application date for 48 of those observations through PIM. We sourced PPA application dates for another six observations from PPA-related correspondence (including the PPA decision document). We had to rely on PIM entries for PPA dates for 22 observations because either the application itself was not dated, or there was no PPA application in the PIM portal. San Francisco's PPA process required project proponents to submit significant information about the proposed development.

Another example relates to San Francisco Planning's policy that mandates a pre-application neighborhood notification process, and a pre-application hearing called the "Pre-Application Community Outreach Process" or "Pre-Application Meeting."[43] This pre-application process requires project proponents to send notices and copies of plans to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations *before* applying to develop land for any new construction or alteration that would change an existing structure by seven vertical feet or 10 horizontal feet. San Francisco Planning compiles the list of neighborhood organizations that project proponents must notify. Though PIM makes most PPAs available, PIM rarely provides source documents that furnish detail about pre-application hearings.

Also relevant, determining compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act requires tracking whether a project proponent applied for entitlement by submitting an application package to the Planning Department. While our dataset contains initial application dates for most of our 2018 - 2021 observations, we can source these dates from primary source documents—signed and dated applications—for only 58 observations. We rely on references to application dates in Plan Check Letters sent by the Planning Department and approval documents in another 29 observations. Where we do not have a primary source document, we rely on PIM entries for application dates, which is data that a San Francisco Planning Department planner entered into the PIM system directly.

In sum, more than half (56%) of the application dates in our dataset are essentially self-reported dates from Planning—and not readily verifiable with application documents. We also highlight here that in at least four instances, the PIM entry reports an application date *after* the approval event (which is available through a primary source document). In another five instances, the PIM system reports an application date that is prior to the PPA date. We assume these are errors (an application should neither follow an entitlement nor predate a preliminary application procedure) but we report out what the data shows, nonetheless. Although these potential errors do not impact descriptive findings on time frames to approval, they do limit analysis of consistency with the PSA.

---

[43] *Pre-Application Meeting*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/pre-application-meeting (July 30, 2023).

### Regression Analysis

We ran several regressions to analyze existing relationships within the CALES dataset. We include all regressions, supplementary analysis, and robustness checks in a separate methods Appendix A, though the main findings are in this report. We ran regression models on 2014 - 2017 data and 2018 - 2021 data separately, and then together. We used the statsmodel Python module[44] to run all regressions in this analysis. We calculated all regression coefficients with robust standard errors (Errors of Order 3 (HC3)) in order to account for the existence of outliers and other issues within the data such as heteroskedasticity (variation in regression errors across our observations) and provide a small sample correction.[45] Note that if we did not use robust standard errors, the standard errors of our estimates would be smaller, so the standard errors and subsequent hypothesis testing are conservative.

### In-Depth Interviews and Meetings and Review of Public Hearings

We have interviews from our prior research across cities from 2017. We used transcripts from six interviews conducted in 2017 with stakeholders within San Francisco (an affordable developer, market-rate developer, city employee who managed affordable development, city planner, land use attorney, and community organization advocate) in this analysis. For this research, we also completed an additional 28 in-depth interviews with 18 additional participants that did not participate in interviews in prior years or in meetings led by HCD between late-fall 2022 and May 2023. We interviewed participants from the following groups: developers (market-rate and non-profit affordable developers); private sector professionals (architects, land use lawyers, planners); government personnel (including city planning staff); and representatives from community-based organizations (including affordable housing advocates). We identified some of these interview participants as experts within San Francisco and reached out to them to participate in an interview. Other participants reached out to us to participate in interviews as well. We advised all participants that the research would be reported to HCD, but we would protect the confidentiality of each participant consistent with our research protocols. For that reason, we do not quote any individual participant and only report on themes based on what multiple participants or entire stakeholder groups shared.

We observed another 33 meetings that HCD convened for their Policy and Practice Review with approximately 146 stakeholders, including city planning personnel, Commissioners, Supervisors, market-rate developers, affordable developers, and housing organizations. Twenty of those meetings invited one participant, and five meetings invited two to three participants. These 25 HCD-led meetings with one to three participants offered in-depth conversations, much like research interviews. Most were an hour, though a few were longer or shorter. Most meetings included participants, one member of the HCD team and O'Neill. A handful of much larger meetings (with more than three participants) included more than two HCD team members

---

[44] Documentation for this module can be found at STATSMODELS, statsmodels.org/stable/index.html (May 5, 2023).

[45] In regression analysis, the errors are defined by the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable (in this case, project timeframes) and values predicted by the regression specification. Accurate estimation of the uncertainty of OLS-predicted values generally depends on constant errors across observations. However, in this study, we do not assume that error is constant (homoscedasticity). For instance, model error might be larger for observations with substantially longer timeframes (i.e., where projects take two to three times longer than the median timeframe). When we use robust standard errors, we no longer assume that errors are constant across all observations, which can mitigate the impacts of this regression analysis being based on observational data. Further, we are using a small sample correction to mitigate the fact that our universe of observations is relatively small and to account for the natural clustering in timeframes that occurs at each local land use approval step.

and O'Neill, along with participants. In each of these meetings, HCD informed the participants that O'Neill would be observing and listening to the conversation for research purposes and that the research would support the state's Policy and Practice Review. About half of the meetings with Commissioners and Supervisors also included a deputy city attorney in the meeting with HCD. Stakeholders discussed planning review and post-entitlement processes in-depth.

In all, we analyzed notes from interviews and meetings with representatives from six different housing advocacy groups, over 20 planning staff and more than 60 development professionals (evenly split between affordable and market-rate development). We also heard from 14 individuals split across the executive and legislative bodies within San Francisco.

Two members of the research team performed a line-by-line reading of a subset (10%) of the interview transcripts and notes from interviews and meetings[46] to identify recurrent concepts to generate a codebook in MaxQDA. We developed codes through an inductive process—a process in which we analyzed the transcript to identify codes based on themes that the speaker emphasizes. We also generated some codes for analysis using a deductive process—a process in which we analyze the notes and transcripts for content which indicates the speaker perceives that San Francisco either violated a state law *or* believes a policy or practice blocks a state law from having its intended effect. Once we had a codebook, three members of the research team coded all transcripts using the same software. We used MaxQDA software to summarize the findings by code and used the summaries to identify cross-cutting themes. This report pulled out findings where the team reached greater than 90% agreement on coded segments. We also generated stakeholder abstracts that summarized dominant themes (including internal consensus and disagreement on key topics within stakeholder groups).

Where interview participants or meeting participants directed us to specific public hearings, we also reviewed those hearings to confirm what participants shared did occur. We only inserted quotes from public hearings or relevant media reporting into this report and did not include any direct quotes from conversations between stakeholders and either HCD or O'Neill.

### Document Analysis

Both interview and meeting participants, along with data collection, identified more than 41 proposed developments for a more detailed review process by our research team. We also located and analyzed documents associated with those 41 potential developments to explore in-depth what occurred during planning review.

### Study and Data Limitations

Regression analysis using CALES data does not establish causal relationships. We rely on qualitative data to establish causality. Interview data is limited by the fact that all study participants volunteered. Relatedly, data from individuals and groups that agreed to participate in meetings with HCD is also limited by the fact that these participants volunteered. Voluntary participation in interviews increases selection bias and limits the generalizability of findings from interviews. We increased the number of interviews to reduce bias, but that does not allow us to generalize about San Francisco's policies or practices. Interview findings, however, can help us craft questions for quantitative analysis. Interview findings can provide important insights when

[46] Some participants asked that the interview/meeting not be recorded for transcription purposes. In those instances, O'Neill took detailed notes during the conversation, and the team joined those notes with transcripts from other interviews or meetings for qualitative analysis.

combined with regression and spatial analysis that regression and spatial analysis alone cannot yield.

The advantage of our 2014 - 2017 entitlement dataset is that it is uniquely detailed. The limitation of that dataset, however, is that our original coding structure aimed for comparative analysis across cities. This means that when we coded our 2014 - 2017 observations, we collapsed some San Francisco processes into single variables to compare processes across jurisdictions. For example, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations were coded together in our master dataset as "exceptions" because that was the most analogous to similar processes in other cities. That limits our ability to explore how those two distinct processes operate when we are studying San Francisco only. To address this in coding for the 2018 - 2021 data, we created two coded datasets. The 2014 - 2017 dataset has less detail than the 2018 - 2021 dataset.

Another important limitation of our entire entitlement and SB 35 approval dataset relates to what each observation represents. Each observation reflects successful entitlements or SB 35 approvals only. That means that this universe of projects that we use for quantitative and spatial analyses represents those developments that successfully navigated the entitlement process in San Francisco. This means that the observations also represent those developments that developers likely had a high enough probability of success that they were willing to pursue entitlement in the first place. We do not have data suitable for quantitative analysis on when and how the city may have denied applications for entitlement in our dataset. That was beyond the current research scope. There is also no reliable data suitable for quantitative or spatial analyses on parcels where a property owner is unwilling to apply for entitlement.

Also, we gathered insights from stakeholders through interviews regarding what occurs during entitlement and what influences whether some buildings get built. Specifically, stakeholders suggest that smaller buildings, which those stakeholders define as 20 units or less, may get entitled but become financially difficult to build post-entitlement. The stakeholders attributed this to an entitlement process that mediates conflicts with opponents in a way that may lead to a final entitlement of a project that is not financially possible to build.[47] If entitlement processes contribute to whether a proposed development is financially feasible—and in turn whether a developer will pull building permits to build—then theoretically we might see a difference in the rate of filing for building permits for buildings that are 20 units or less as compared to larger buildings (21 units or more).

We have two challenges concerning exploring this issue with quantitative methods. The first is that augmenting the entitlement data with post-entitlement permitting data is very difficult; San Francisco's building permit data is not as accessible online or as reliable as entitlement data. Also, San Francisco's local law makes it difficult to systematically identify what counts as the permit that represents the beginning of construction activity and/or intent to build the building because San Francisco has a discretionary building permit process.

[47] Relatedly, at the time of this writing, the San Francisco Chronicle reported on a study concluding that the City's Inclusionary Housing Program is rendering some development fiscally infeasible. *See* Noah Arroyo, *Affordable-Housing Quotas Imperil New S.F. Building Projects, Study Says*, S.F. CHRON. (Jan. 22, 2023), https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-affordable-housing-projects-17727101.php.

# Findings

We report findings in response to each of the questions that HCD asked, drawing on all data and methods to answer each question. Our findings sometimes rely on data from both our 2014 - 2017 and 2018 - 2021 datasets, and sometimes draw exclusively on the 2018 - 2021 dataset. We also compare four years to four years where appropriate and construct year-to-year comparisons or group years by two-year comparisons (e.g., 2014 - 2015 compared with 2018 - 2019) where appropriate.

Table 3 summarizes the total number of observations in our dataset, and the units they would yield if built, both in terms of market-rate units and affordable units. We narrowly define affordable units to refer to deed-restricted below market-rate housing units. Group housing, student housing, and single room occupancy housing are not included in any affordable housing count. Table 4 elaborates on the type of observations within our 2018 - 2021 data only.

*Table 3: Summary of Total Approvals and Unit Counts Across Study Period*

| Study Period | Total Approvals | Total Units | Affordable Units | % Affordable Units/ All Units |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 - 2017 Units from Entitlement of Developments of Five or More Units | 140 | 14,269 | 2,168 | 15% |
| 2018 - 2021 Units Approved from Approval of Developments of Five or More Units | 144 | 11,339 | 3,039 | 27% |

*Table 4: 2018-2021 Approval Observations and Units by Affordability and Process*

| Affordability Category | Project Count | Market-rate Units | Affordable Units |
|---|---|---|---|
| 100% Market-Rate Discretionary Non-ADU[1] | 55 | 4,264 | – |
| 100% Market-Rate Discretionary ADU[2] | 16 | 110 | – |
| Mixed-Income Discretionary Non-ADU | 52 | 3,473 | 873 |
| Mixed-Income Discretionary ADU | 1 | 21 | 3 |
| Mixed-Income SB 35 | 2 | 4 | 1,659 |
| 100% Affordable Discretionary Non-ADU | 4 | 4 | 210 |
| 100% Affordable SB 35 | 14 | 426 | 294 |

[1]This includes 2 Group Housing Projects and 1 Student Housing Project.

Although we elaborate on the contours of specific rules and planning practices when we discuss each finding, there are the two aspects of San Francisco's local law that dominate nearly all interviews and provide critical framing for virtually all of our findings. The first local law is one that makes all housing approvals in San Francisco discretionary. The Municipal Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 26(a) provides that San Francisco's departments may "take into consideration the effects of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents . . . [and to] exercise its [or their] sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked." The city interprets this law as granting the Planning Commission discretionary authority over all building permits, including permits not otherwise discretionary under zoning and planning requirements. The Planning Commission delegates this discretionary authority to the Planning Department to review applications that meet Planning Code standards and Design Guidelines. But when disputes arise over a building permit, "concerned parties may choose to file a [request for exceptional] DR."[48] A DR effectively stops the Planning Department's approval process, sets a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission, and triggers additional planning staff analysis to prepare for the hearing.

Once a party has requested DR, unless they withdraw their request, there is always a public hearing. At the public hearing, the Planning Commission reviews materials and hears testimony and then determines whether it will "approve, disapprove or require modifications to the project."[49] The city states that the Planning Commission exercises this form of discretionary review only in exceptional circumstances when disputes between neighbors cannot be resolved through mediation.[50] The procedure, based on how it is written, indicates that the process of requesting and holding a hearing can add months to the approval timeline, even if the Planning Commission leaves the Planning Department's approval intact.

Another topic that dominated interviews is the ease with which project opponents can challenge discretionary approvals and post-entitlement permits through an administrative appeal under City Charter Section 4.106(b). The city charter provides that the Board of Appeals (an appointed political body) will hear appeals of building permits and demolition permits, unless either permit is issued after the Planning Commission authorizes a Conditional Use.[51] The Board of Supervisors hears appeals of any post-entitlement permit associated with a Conditional Use Authorization and any appeal of a CEQA decision.[52]

## San Francisco's local rules prevent full implementation of the goals and aims of state housing laws.

HCD asked whether the data shows that San Francisco is fully implementing state law, including the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, Permit Streamlining Act, SB 35, and State Density Bonus Law. The answer, as indicated by the data, is no. Developers, planning professionals, and most housing advocacy organizations perceive local rules as

---

[48] *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[49] *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[50] The city also elaborates on its interpretation of the power this provision affords the Planning Commission in the Application Packet for Discretionary Review. *See Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[51] The city details the limitations of the Board of Appeal's jurisdiction. *About Us, Board of Appeals*, SF.GOV, https://sf.gov/departments/board-appeals/about (last visited Sept 18, 2023).
[52] Appeal of Certain CEQA Decisions, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., ADMIN. CODE § 31.16 (2013).

blocking the full implementation of the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act (SB 330), Permit Streamlining Act, and State Density Bonus Law. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of housing approvals yields findings that are consistent with these stakeholder perceptions. Stakeholders also report that SB 35 effectively expedites planning review, but does not resolve post-entitlement problems within San Francisco.

We report findings related to SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law first, and then move through findings related to steps in the entitlement and post-entitlement process.

## San Francisco Planning fully implemented SB 35, but SB 35 is not a complete process fix.

SB 35 provides a state ministerial process for qualifying urban multifamily code compliant housing developments in jurisdictions that fail to meet their RHNA production targets in prior RHNA cycles. In San Francisco, SB 35 applies to qualifying housing where 50% or more of the units are affordable. A ministerial process is significant for developers and planners in San Francisco because local law renders all approvals discretionary. The state ministerial process eliminates pre-application requirements and hearings (discussed in more detail below), the opportunity for project opponents to request DR, and CEQA review. Once San Francisco Planning determines a project is eligible for SB 35, the developer proceeds directly to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for permitting.

### SB 35 processing timeframes are fast—whereas discretionary building permits typically take years.

SB 35 cabins the eligibility review period to 90 or 180 days depending on the project size (measured by units).[53] Like many other cities, San Francisco "restarts" the review clock if there are any changes to the application.[54] The data shows San Francisco Planning diligently applied this state law. We found that planning review for developments that began as SB 35 applications take about four months but no more than eight months. Table 7 shows that, in contrast, discretionary building permits take approximately two years to entitle or complete planning review before they begin to work with the DBI. Stakeholders explain that entitlement delays increase holding costs, but approval delays may also result in being subject to higher fees, particularly when delays span over years. Timeframes for all non-ADU developments along specific approval pathways spotlight the difficulty of entitlement and the need for a local ministerial process in addition to other zoning and procedural reforms.

[53] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65913.15(c)(1)-(2) (West 2023).
[54] Moira O'Neill & Ivy Wang, *How Can Procedural Reform Support Fair Share Housing Production? Assessing the Effects of California's Senate Bill 35,* 25 CITYSCAPE 143, 143-70 (2023).

*Table 5: Entitlement Timeframe by Approval Pathway 2018-2021*

| Process Categorization | Min. Timeframe | **Median Timeframe** | Max. Timeframe | **Mean Timeframe** | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SB 35 Only (no discretionary process prior) (N=9) | 0.89 | **3.42** | 7.63 | **4.29** | 2.63 |
| SB 35 Conversion (all began as discretionary) (N=7)[2] | 15.39 | **29.39** | 41.39 | **29.18** | 10.32 |
| Discretionary BP (N=17) | 7.76 | **24.20** | 47.70 | **24.07** | 8.58 |
| Discretionary BP with Exceptional DR request (N=4)[3] | 10.32 | **32.33** | 55.56 | **32.64** | 19.76 |
| Variance (by ZA) (N=11) | 19.73 | **36.00** | 69.27 | **41.40** | 19.96 |
| Variance (by ZA) with Exceptional DR (N=5) | 10.39 | **39.48** | 146.69 | **59.28** | 52.30 |
| Variance (by Planning Commission) and Exceptional DR (N=1) | 46.68 | **46.68** | 46.68 | **46.68** | — |
| DPA / LPA / SPA (N=15) | 23.31 | **35.67** | 67.03 | **38.33** | 13.59 |
| CUA Only (N=17) | 18.71 | **35.05** | 59.34 | **35.90** | 12.45 |
| CUA[4] Pplus (N=30) | 17.00 | **39.68** | 105.40 | **46.01** | 21.99 |
| PUD[5] (N=2) | 7.73 | **24.53** | 41.33 | **24.53** | 23.76 |
| Development Agreement (N=4) | 32.09 | **42.16** | 51.52 | **41.98** | 7.94 |
| Map Amendment/General Plan Amendment (N=3) | 34.49 | **42.08** | 64.90 | **47.16** | 15.83 |

[1] We do not include two observations, discretionary building permit projects with additional administrative approvals, in this timeline calculation. One involved a discretionary building permit and an exception, and the other was a discretionary building permit with an ADU.
[2] We have one additional SB 35 project in this category that does not have an eligibility determination date. Though we know it received a building permit, we cannot include it for timeframe calculations. Each of the observations in this category proceeded through a discretionary approval process before initiating an SB 35 application. Some applications pre-date SB 35's enactment.
[3] This includes two discretionary building permits that received requests for exceptional DR and faced administrative appeals.
[4] Includes CUAs with other processes that typically go to the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission but not the Board of Supervisors (such as CUA with a Variance, or CUA with a Certificate of Appropriateness).
[5] PUD refers to Planned Unit Development.

### Developers report that SB 35 transformed planning approval pathways for affordable development.

Developers described SB 35 as eliminating risk because the law creates certainty in entitlement where none existed before. Some planners reported a steep learning curve at the outset; they shared that major changes like this to planning review are difficult to implement at first—and that early state guidance could help planning staff improve implementation. Developers, however, described San Francisco Planning's implementation of SB 35 as efficient and helpful. The data largely confirms that San Francisco Planning made most SB 35 eligibility determinations quickly and within required timeframes. The outliers represent proposals to develop affordable housing using local discretionary processes, sometimes because the project proponent filed the application before SB 35's passage and/or effective date.

Approval data also shows that state ministerial review allowed for faster processing which facilitated the approval of nearly three times the number of 100% affordable developments in 2018 - 2021 as compared to 2014 - 2017. There were only five 100% affordable developments entitled in 2014 - 2017. In 2018 - 2021 alone, San Francisco approved eighteen 100% affordable developments, and 14 of those developments used SB 35's ministerial process. Because of SB 35, most affordable units approved in 2018 - 2021 came through ministerially approved 100% affordable developments that used State Density Bonus Law. In 2014 - 2017, 74% of affordable units came from mixed income developments. In 2018 - 2021, 62% of all affordable units came from 100% affordable developments.

*Figure 3: Distribution of Affordable Units by Development Type*




Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

## SB 35 does not resolve post-entitlement opposition through appeals.

Affordable developers that have used SB 35 describe several post-entitlement difficulties that extend construction timelines. One difficulty affordable developers describe is that San Francisco's local rules allow project opponents to use the administrative appeals process to delay construction by challenging post-entitlement permits. (We discuss other post-entitlement difficulties below.) Construction activity impacts neighbors, who then may file complaints during the construction process.[55] But some neighborhood organizations escalate their opposition to construction by using administrative appeals to the Board of Appeals, which under local law suspends permit approvals until the appeal is resolved.[56]

2550 Irving Street exemplifies how post-entitlement challenges can delay construction of housing approved under SB 35. 2550 Irving, a 100% affordable development that would provide 90 units of supportive housing,[57] has faced at least two post-entitlement appeals of permits.[58] San Francisco Planning determined the development was SB 35 eligible on August 17, 2022. In November 2022, the Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association appealed the demolition permit required to demolish a two-story office building because of concerns about toxins. The filing of the appeal suspended the building permit pending resolution. The Board of Appeals heard the

[55] One notable example relates to 78 Haight Street, which will house transitional-aged youth at risk of homelessness. We found three complaints from neighbors about construction logged in PIM so far. A neighborhood organization complains about inadequate notices about this development online, as well (though it characterizes the housing product incorrectly). *78 Haight*, HAYES VALLEY SAFE, https://www.hvsafe.com/78-haight/ (Mar. 17, 2022).

[56] Wherever PIM recorded an administrative appeal of a permit, we captured that in our database. San Francisco's public portal provides incomplete information about appeals and post-entitlement challenges, so we also asked interview participants to provide examples of projects that faced post-entitlement challenges. We then cross-referenced the DBI permitting system to see if we could find more information on the impact of appeals on permits.

[57] Application data indicates that at one point, this project was proposed to offer 98 units.

[58] San Francisco's public portal reports two appeals associated with the demolition permit for this development, both filed on December 5, 2022 (numbers 22-091 and 22-092). The neighborhood association also filed an appeal of the construction permit.

first appeal of the demolition permit on February 22, 2023, and denied the appeal (with a 3-2 split vote). Online records show that DBI reinstated the building permit, months after the initial approval date of October 28, 2022, on March 7, 2023. The same organization also appealed the construction site permit, originally approved on June 26, 2023. This permit was also suspended pending resolution, and on August 16, 2023, the Board of Appeals voted 2-2 on whether to grant the appeal and whether to continue the hearing. Both the appeal and the motion to continue failed as only four of five Commissioners were present. Ahead of both hearings, HCD sent Letters of Technical Assistance to the City and County of San Francisco's Board of Appeals regarding 2550 Irving, informing San Francisco that under state law, the city should not hear administrative appeals on SB 35 approvals.[59]

In related media, the neighborhood organization stated that they want more environmental remediation before construction.[60] The developer and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development pointed to testing, review, and approval from public health and toxic substances agencies. The Chronicle reported that Supervisor Engardio publicly expressed support for 2550 Irving as "much needed [housing that] should not be delayed" though he also believed agencies could better communicate safety assurances to neighbors.[61] During confidential interviews, however, some stakeholders shared that they do not believe the neighborhood association is primarily concerned about environmental hazards; some stakeholders instead believe that the neighborhood opposes the development because of its size and the development's intended residents.

The agenda for the hearing on August 16, 2023, included a ~1,200-page record for this one appeal. During the hearing, Board of Appeals Commissioners disagreed about the effect of SB 35 on their power to review the permit and the appropriate scope of authority for Commissioners to exercise, generally, when deciding a matter that requires technical expertise. The Commissioner remarks during the hearing illustrate several of the ideological divides within local political bodies that stakeholders described during interviews. The public comments from Commissioners, some of which are quoted below, reveal conflicting perspectives on the normative value of state preemption of local power, the appropriate scope of administrative review of the work product from agency personnel with specific technical expertise, and the purpose and function of the Board of Appeals in general.

> Another point I wanted to make is in regard to SB 35 and SB 35 preemption. As one of the public commenters commented tonight . . . since SB 35 was passed several years ago, 2018-2019, **there has been a proliferation of new state level legislation also taking aim at local review processes**. And most have been drafted by San Francisco's own representatives in Sacramento, and those representatives in Sacramento need to know your opinions on these things **because they're doing their darndest to make sure there is no review process anymore, that the planning commission can't hear these items and they're trying to get it so that the Board of Appeals can't hear these items either, and if you believe in local review as I do as a member of this body, it's your duty and your responsibility to let your representatives**

---

[59] One of the letters is available online. *See* Letter from Shannan West, Hous. Accountability Unit Chief, Cal. Dep't Hous. & Cmty. Dev., to S.F. Bd. of Appeals, City & Cnty of S.F. (Feb. 22, 2022), https://www.hcd.ca.gov/sites/default/files/docs/planning-and-community/HAU/SanFrancisco-LOSTA-022223.pdf.

[60] The Chronicle reports on the challenges. *See, e.g.*, J.K. Dineen, *Judge Rules Contested Sunset District Affordable Housing Project Can Proceed*, S.F. CHRON. (Dec. 9, 2021), https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/judge-rules-contested-sunset-district-affordable-16688685.php (unsuccessful attempt to secure an injunction).

[61] *Id*.

**know what's at stake here and what this means to you** [deep pause] I do think what's going on here goes far beyond the lot lines of 2550 Irving, and I don't necessarily think that even granting this appeal will fix the larger environmental hazards in the Sunset District . . . but I think there is a much bigger picture here in terms of the legal background and what is going on between several different agencies . . . .[62]

I see a distinct difference between that remediation and the permit here that we are here to pass judgment on. . . . We recognize that there is a problem . . . that problem is there is PEC contamination in the Central Sunset particularly around this site, and that needs to be remediated. . . . However, I see a distinct difference between that remediation and the permit we are here to pass judgment upon . . . . The appellant themselves admitted that the construction of this site has no bearing on the issues and levels that will be taking place in the neighborhood. So I see a very bright line between the contamination which needs to be remedied, and the permit that we are here to consider. . . . You know what, this is something that happens to us a lot in different circumstances, usually less dire, usually with a lot less scientific data that we have to parse our way through. When we end up with landlord-tenant issues, we find ourselves with a conflict . . . that needs to be worked out . . . . [I]t is probably best venued in the civil courts . . . but we look not to that issue, but we look to the permit and underlying issues within our jurisdiction . . . . **I see how SB 35 can be very confusing, it can be tedious, it can be difficult, but I have to ask myself do we have grounds under SB 35 to have grounds to appeal this, or overturn this permit, even if we identified it as being material to these issues that were here and I don't think this permit is material to the contamination thing, but even if we did, in this circumstance I don't see a way to get there because the objective standards under the Planning Code . . . are through the Maher ordinance**.[63] DPH has engaged the Maher procedures. They've gone one further for us as a neighborhood association has for them to do and brought in the DTSC because they have more expertise and more resources . . . and so that process that is supposed to take place is ongoing . . . . Let's be clear here, we get nervous sometimes as a board about playing amateur architect. **Right now we're playing scientists and we're playing amateur environmental scientists . . . . [L]et's realize it doesn't have anything to do with the permit in front of us today. I will not move to uphold the appeal**.

I so fundamentally disagree . . . . [P]eople on appeals boards make judgments on experts all the time . . . . And then we had people representing to us that there would be communication, same thing, they made it sound like there was going to be community participation, none occurred . . . . **I think there is an appropriate time to say that the experts got it wrong, or the process was wrong**. . . . I would ask that we continue this [to allow Board of Appeals President to join discussion].[64]

I am not comfortable telling the Sunset residents that they should feel safe, and that is what it really boils down to for me, it is a moral ethical issue for me, and I do and I can take that into account. . . . this body isn't the one that should be hearing this, unfortunately we don't have another body that is more appropriate to hear this . . . . [W]e're attorneys not environmental experts . . . . [T]his shouldn't be litigated in the context of permit appeals . . . . [B]ut we don't have an appropriate forum. . . . [**I]nstead what we have is the Board of Appeals, which for all intents and purposes has become a catch all in many ways and we have taken it upon ourselves in many instances to make consequential decisions and push for consequential**

---

[62] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of Alex Lamberg, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.
[63] Commissioner Eppler is referring here to San Francisco Health Code Article 22A that gives the San Francisco Department of Public Health oversight of characterization and mitigation of hazardous substances in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in the Maher Area identified in the city's Building Code Article 106A.3.2.4.
[64] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of John Trasviña, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.

> **change in city policy in city operations in city administration**. And to me this is the most consequential of any the issues we've dealt with since I've been on the board . . . this one takes the cake. There are people's lives at risk here. **And I don't think we should be the body who is imbued with this power, but ultimately our state legislators have ripped away the other layers of review so it can't go to the Planning Commission. It can't go to other commissions. It's here, and we ultimately have de novo review of this, potentially with SB 35 limitations, but you know . . . ultimately legal advice is just that – it's legal advice and we as Commissioners get to make the say.** I obviously don't think we have the votes to grant the appeal here tonight . . . but you know, if there was a time to make a leap of faith, this was the time.[65]

## More developments relied on State Density Bonus Law as compared with prior years, but stakeholders disagree about how easy it is to use the state law.

State Density Bonus law allows for developers building residential or mixed-use projects with five or more units to build more housing units than zoning would otherwise allow in exchange for a prescribed number of below-market-rate units. The law provides bonuses in the form of additional density and waivers of some local standards. State Density Bonus Law is a state mandate and the state law may preempt local implementation programs with a bias towards "producing the maximum number of total housing units" under § 65915(r) of the Government Code. The law prohibits cities from applying development standards to a density bonus project that would make it impossible to build at the densities or with the concessions or incentives provided in State Density Bonus Law.[66] San Francisco's Planning Code Section 206 implements State Density Bonus Law and provides two local density bonus programs, the HOME-SF program[67] and the 100% Affordable Housing Bonus Program.[68]

We found that nearly all SB 35-approved developments also relied on State Density Bonus Law. State ministerial review through SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law allowed for ministerially approved 100% affordable developments that were, on average, larger (measured in units) than 100% affordable developments requiring discretionary review. The median project size (measured by units) of all SB 35 developments is 121 units. The mean is 119 units. The median project size (measured by units) of all 100% affordable non-ADU discretionary observations is 13 units. The mean is 53 units. For comparative purposes, the median project size (measured by units) of 100% affordable developments entitled in 2014 - 2017 was 134 units, and the mean was 113 units. The median project size (measured by units) of all non-ADU discretionary observations is 24 units and the mean is 799 units. The two largest developments that exceeded 800 units if built—among the outliers—required discretionary approval.

---

[65] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of Alex Lamberg, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.
[66] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65915(e)(1) (West 2023).
[67] Housing Opportunities Mean Equity – San Francisco Program (HOME-SF), SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE § 206.3 (2019).
[68] The 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE § 206.4 (2018); *see also Affordable Housing Bonus Program (AHBP)*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/ahbp#:~:text=State%20Density%20Bonus%20Law,-In%201979%2C%20the&text=Ten%20percent%20of%20total%20housing,age%20requirements%20for%20older%20persons (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

*Table 6: Median Project Size by Product Type and Approval Pathway*

| Type | Median Project Size Units | Mean Project Size Units (rounded) | Standard Deviation Project Size Units (rounded) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 100% Market-Rate, Discretionary Non-ADU[1] (N=55) | 9 | 78 | 193 |
| 100% Market-Rate, Discretionary ADU (N=16) | 6 | 7 | 3 |
| Mixed-Income, Discretionary Non-ADU (N=52) | 47 | 84 | 104 |
| Mixed-Income, Discretionary ADU (N=1) | 24 | 24 | — |
| **Mixed-Income, SB 35 (N=2)** | **360** | **360** | **127** |
| 100% Affordable, Discretionary Non-ADU (N=4) | 13 | 53 | 83 |
| **100% Affordable, SB 35 (N=14)** | **121** | **119** | **59** |

[1] This grouping includes two Group Housing Projects and one Student Housing Project.

Thirty-one developments in our 2018 - 2021 dataset used State Density Bonus Law to increase the number of allowable units, and another six developments used the local HOME-SF program (all entitled in 2021). We see a notable increase in projects using density bonus programs in 2021, overall. In total, developments that secured approvals in 2018-2021 relied on density bonus programs more often than the developments entitled in 2014-2017 as well. Only four developments entitled in 2014 - 2017 used any density bonus program.

Also important is that developers used State Density Bonus Law more often than the HOME-SF program. Fifteen SB 35 ministerially approved developments in our 2018 - 2021 dataset all used State Density Bonus Law. The remaining developments that used State Density Bonus Law were discretionary mixed-income developments. At least 13 of the mixed-income developments used State Density Bonus to help meet requirements under the local Inclusionary Housing Program requirements. Five mixed income developments used Home-SF to meet requirements under the local Inclusionary Housing Program requirements as well.

### There was no consensus among developers about how easily developers could use State Density Bonus Law in San Francisco.

Some developers expressed that the waivers both help create an appealing and efficient development and increase the likelihood of entitlement, overall. Some developers shared that the city's local rules and guidelines do not apply state law correctly[69] and/or that the city steered them away from using State Density Bonus Law. Developers also reported that the city applies the law so as to increase inclusionary program fee requirements once development size increases. Planners shared that design review can interfere with application of State Density Bonus Law, as political bodies may request reduced heights or removal of floors to projects that qualify for density bonuses. Affordable developers shared their frustrations concerning how planners have to do substantial work to apply different density bonus programs to help 100% affordable housing developments benefit from SB 35 while also securing required waivers. Planners also commented that State Density Bonus Law is complex, and that they (planners) would really benefit from more state guidance on its application. But planners and affordable developers emphasized that ministerial review and State Density Bonus Law were, together, critical to creating opportunities for more affordable housing within San Francisco.

### Both developers and planners shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to helping developers manage requirements under local rules.

Developers shared that State Density Bonus Law was critical to make development financially feasible. Planners also shared that developers use State Density Bonus Law to facilitate large projects that the Planning Commission might otherwise deny. Planners explained that the city's Large Project Authorization (LPA)—theoretically meant to allow for larger projects and for modifications and waivers—does easily support larger development. Planners perceive that when developers use the modifications and waivers under the LPA, the Planning Commission interprets the project as no longer compliant and covered by the Housing Accountability Act, allowing political bodies to deny approval. Planners report that developers therefore use State Density Bonus Law to make large projects work while also staying covered by the Housing Accountability Act.

One development, outside of our study years, that stakeholders discussed during interviews as illustrative of this issue was **1010 Mission Street**. Planners reported that the developer first sought an LPA for a group housing development which the Planning Commission did not like and denied. The developer then used State Density Bonus Law to get an approval. Cross referencing documents, we found that the developer requested an LPA that was later withdrawn. The developer secured a final entitlement with an Individually Requested State Density Bonus approval and Downtown Project Authorization.

---

[69] Section 206.6 of San Francisco's Planning Code may require revision after the passage of AB 1763, which provides an 80% density bonus, four incentives or concessions, and special parking ratios for 100% affordable housing projects, and AB 2345, which increased the maximum range of the density bonus to 50% for housing projects with 15% very low-income units, 24% lower income units, or 44% moderate income units. *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE §§ 65915(f)(1), (f)(2), (f)(4). AB 2345 also lowers the required percentage of lower income units required to obtain multiple incentives and concessions under § 65915(d)(2). Table 206.6B seems inconsistent with those provisions under state law. San Francisco Planning, however, also issues Bulletins explaining how it applies state law. *See, e.g.,* S.F. PLAN., BULL. NO. 6, IMPLEMENTING THE STATE DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM (Feb. 2023), https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/DB_06_Implementing_State_Density.pdf.

Planners also stated that State Density Bonus law is critical to promoting productive dialogue about how to make proposed developments better, because once it becomes clear that the city cannot deny the project (and only after it is clear the city cannot deny the project), the public discourse shifts towards how to improve the design to be sensitive to neighborhood needs. Participants offered **321 Florida Street**, a mixed-used mixed-income development entitled in 2021 that required an LPA but also used State Density Bonus Law, as an example of a how state law helped secure entitlement rather than a project denial. After it was clear the city could not deny the development, planners also reported that the conversation with the community focused on how to improve the design in a manner that did, in fact, improve the aesthetics of the proposed development. Another example participants provided was **1560 Folsom Street**, another large mixed-use mixed-income development entitled in 2021 that required an LPA but also used State Density Bonus Law. The outcome for 1560 Folsom allowed for special sidewalk placards to celebrate the area's local history.

Planners note, however, that State Density Bonus Law, while critical to increasing certainty of entitlement for larger developments, may not produce more efficient and speedy deliberative processes during entitlement. Consistent with this perception, our data shows that the only approvals under State Density Bonus Law that planning department staff issued were those approvals associated with SB 35 projects. All other requests for density bonuses for discretionary projects required approval from San Francisco's Planning Commission. Relatedly, we found some observations with multiple continuances for hearings for joint LPA and State Density Bonus Law approvals, as well.

Our data also shows that while an LPA coupled with a State Density Bonus Law approval may secure approval from the Planning Commission, the approval is still vulnerable to being overturned by the Board of Supervisors if the community perceives the final entitlement outcome to be contrary to neighborhood needs. **2300 Harrison Street** illustrates this issue. This proposed mixed-use building would have added three stories to an existing three-story commercial building and demolished an adjacent parking lot. The development would add ~27,000 square feet of office and retail space on a site occupied by Lyft, along with 24 units of housing, of which three would be deed-restricted affordable. After the Planning Commission approved the development, community organizations appealed the Community Plan Exception under CEQA to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors unanimously upheld the appeal. A community group publicly stated that the entitled development represented an exploitation of State Density Bonus Law.[70]

[70] Media reported that the new development would result in ~95,000 square feet of retail/commercial space. We reviewed the project proposal documents, and those documents indicate the proposed development would *add* approximately ~27,000 square feet of commercial space, and 24 units of housing, *to an existing* building that had ~68,000 square feet of office space. *See* Laura Waxmann, *S.F. Supervisors Take United Stance Against Mission Development at Former Lyft Offices*, S.F. BUS. TIMES (Aug 19, 2020), https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2020/08/19/sf-supervisors-vote-down-mission-district-office.html.

*Table 7: Frequency of Use of Density Bonus (All Programs)[1]*

| Year (N=Total Approvals/Per Year) | N Density Bonus Used | | N State Density Bonus used |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 (N=24) | 0 | | - |
| 2015 (N=23) | 0 | | - |
| 2016 (N=55) | 1 | | Unknown |
| 2017 (N=38) | 3 | | Unknown |
| 2018 (N=33) | SB 35: 3 | Other: 3 | 5 |
| 2019 (N=34) | SB 35: 3 | Other: 2 | 5 |
| 2020 (N=25) | SB 35: 5 | Other: 2 | 7 |
| 2021 (N=41) | SB 35: 4 | Other: 15 | 16 |

[1]We do not calculate which density bonus programs (state or local) 2014 - 2017 entitlements used.

Stakeholders also do not agree on whether State Density Bonus Law is good for San Francisco. Market-rate developers shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to increasing the feasibility of housing development while also satisfying the local inclusionary program as on-site requirements increased over time.[71] Affordable developers heavily relied on State Density Bonus Law to increase the size of 100% affordable development, which did increase the number of units approved. Some Commissioners and Supervisors also described density bonuses as critical to reaching affordable housing targets.

But some Commissioners and Supervisors expressed concern about how the city's application of State Density Bonus Law might derail community outreach or historic preservation. Some planners shared that implementing State Density Bonus Law was difficult at times and required educating political bodies on where San Francisco retained discretion and where it did not under the law (which was further complicated by San Francisco's context of all permitting being discretionary). Planners also perceived that local political bodies did not like the impact of State

[71] Section 415.3 details the thresholds. Qualifying applications initiated before January 12, 2016, had a 14.5% on-site inclusionary requirement; applications initiated after that date had variable thresholds depending on the project size and a complex scheme of alternatives. Under Section 415.6(a)(1), a development larger than 10 units but smaller than 25 that elected on-site units would have to meet a 12% threshold. Section 415.6 (a)(2) and (a)(3) provided that owner occupied developments of 25 units or more would have to meet a 20% threshold, and rentals developments larger than 25 units would have to meet a 18% threshold. Section Section 415.6(a)(5) also provided for incremental increases beginning in 2018, which would raise the thresholds even higher for developments of 10 – 24 units to 15% and larger developments would increase incrementally each year, but not to exceed 26% for owner occupied developments and 24% for rental developments. SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE §§ 415.3, 415.6 (2021).

Density Bonus Law on urban form because it limited subjectivity in design review, or its impact on inclusionary outcomes in terms of the overall yield of on-site affordable units.[72] Consistent with these planner perceptions, some Commissioners and Supervisors did express concern about state law that overrides design considerations.

## Local rules complicate application of the Housing Accountability Act.

When discussing the importance of SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law, another important theme emerged. Several stakeholder groups reported that local political bodies do not consistently follow the Housing Accountability Act and deny proposed development covered under state law. Importantly, stakeholders did not describe the Planning Commission as blatantly violating state law but explained that instead, complex local rules make it difficult to determine which local approvals are within the purview of the Housing Accountability Act and which are not. If there is any ambiguity about whether the Housing Accountability Act applies, and a proposed development is at all controversial, that ambiguity leads to a project denial.

Planners emphasized here again the importance of state guidance on how the law changes local processes. When state law does not create a ministerial process (like SB 35) but limits local discretion, state guidance provides clear communication to political bodies and the public how the state law changes local processes. That is critical, planners say, in a local context like San Francisco where at least some within the political bodies and communities interpret local rules as allowing the city to retain the power to deny an approval. If state law significantly limits the right to deny an approval, planners recommend that the state guidance be clear so as to enable staff and Commissioners to say publicly that state law dictates a particular outcome.[73]

## Local rules require entitlement processes begin before the application—and navigate multiple hurdles along the way to approval.

Prior to July 1, 2023, the process for entitlement for many multifamily non-ADU and non-SB 35 developments began with a required Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA).[74] The Mayor's Office recently eliminated this hurdle through an Executive Directive, but we explain how this impacted the observations within our dataset.

Under the PPA process, a project proponent was required to complete the PPA before they could submit their project application. San Francisco's PPA process required project proponents to submit significant information about the proposed development. We have 87 observations in our dataset that would have required a PPA application under that local policy. We can verify PPA application dates against source documents for more than half of those, but otherwise rely

---

[72] Commissioner Diamond on June 1, 2023, expressed concern about the impact of State Density Bonus Law on urban form when questioning whether Supervisor Melgar's proposed legislation to increase density in a west side neighborhood would, in conjunction with State Density Bonus Law, lead to nine-story buildings.

[73] It is important to note, however, that during this research, HCD sent two advisory letters to the city on the impact of SB 35 on post-entitlement administrative appeals, and the limitations that SB 35 placed on San Francisco's ability to hear post-entitlement appeals in the context of an SB 35 approval. San Francisco's Board of Appeals heard both post-entitlement administrative appeals, even though at least one of these letters explicitly stated that SB 35 did not allow for post-entitlement appeals.

[74] San Francisco Planning now provides that it no longer accepts PPAs consistent with the Mayor's Executive Directive issued on February 7, 2023, subsection II.9. OFF. OF THE MAYOR, CITY & CNTY. OF S.F., DIRECTIVE 23-01, HOUSING FOR ALL (Feb. 7, 2023), https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-02/Executive%20Directive%2023-01_Housing%20for%20All.pdf.

on self-reported dates from San Francisco's system. The average time from PPA application to project application was about a year.

*Table 8: PPA to Application Timeframes*

| (months) | **Median** | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|
| PPA to Earliest Application Date | 4.96 | 11.71 | 21.00 |

San Francisco Planning, responding to direction from the Mayor's Office, eliminated the PPA process. Still, San Francisco Planning policy mandates a neighborhood notification process before a project proponent files an application, and a pre-application hearing called the "Pre-Application Community Outreach Process" or "Pre-Application Meeting."[75] This pre-application process requires project proponents to send notices and copies of plans to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations *before* applying to develop land for any new construction or alteration that would change an existing structure by 7 vertical feet or 10 horizontal feet. San Francisco Planning compiles the list of neighborhood organizations that project proponents must notify. However, San Francisco Planning does not consistently track pre-application meetings in its public portal.

Stakeholders have differing perspectives on the value of this pre-application meeting process. Some Commissioners and Supervisors referred to the pre-application process as important community outreach. Other stakeholders perceive it as a requirement that assumes conflict exists before a developer has even proposed a development.

### Application intake processes were inconsistent with the PSA but improved marginally over time.

The Permit Streamlining Act (PSA) requires cities to provide information to applicants about city requirements for applications to develop housing and sets limits on how long a city can take to determine an application is complete and begin planning review. This state law applies to all discretionary development projects that are quasi-adjudicatory actions (like a variance or conditional use requirement). The PSA also limits the amount of time a city can take to process an application, but the clock begins to run after Planning prepares environmental review documents.

We collected information on application dates, and any notices regarding the status of applications and the dates of those notices, when available on PIM, for 135 discretionary, non-ADU entitlements that we believe did not require a legislative act or development agreement for approval. This list includes more observations than we analyze—or it includes observations we collected some data on that we did not include in our timeline analysis because they were not yet entitled, or they were entitled in 2022 or 2023 .

Of these 135 observations, we found notifications sent to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 75 observations(~56%). Of those 75 observations, we were able to determine

[75] *Pre-Application Meeting*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/pre-application-meeting (July 30, 2023).

an application date and notice of status date for 72 observations. Of those 72 observations, 56 notifications (~78%) were outside of the required 30-day period. Of the 56 (out of 72 observations) that are in our dataset for analysis (observations entitled from 2018 - 2021), 41 notifications (~73%) were outside of the required 30-day period.

This does not mean that San Francisco Planning complied with the PSA in the other 60 instances, only that there is insufficient data to determine compliance or non-compliance with the PSA in half the observations.

We also looked at whether San Francisco Planning improved its project intake and notification processes over time. We have a confirmed application date for 130 out of 135 observations. In all five observations where we could not confirm an application date, we could also not confirm a notice of status date. Of these 130 observations, 65 observations have a confirmed application date after 1/1/2018, and 65 observations have a confirmed application date before 1/1/2018.

Of the 65 observations that have a confirmed application date after 1/1/2018, we found San Francisco Planning sent notifications to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 53 observations (~82%). Of these 53 observations, 37 notifications are dated after the required 30-day period (70%). Of the 65 observations that have a confirmed application date before 1/1/2018, we found notifications sent to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 19 observations (~29%). Of these 19 observations, 19 notifications are dated after the required 30-day period (100%). This suggests that San Francisco improved its application intake and notification process, but only marginally. What is also clear is San Francisco Planning is doing a better job to track the data, which can facilitate internal monitoring of this issue and continued improvement.

*Table 9: Analysis of Application Status Notifications*

| | Application Date Before 1/1/2018 (N=65) | Application Date After 1/1/2018 (N= 65) |
|---|---|---|
| Percentage of observations where notice of application status is available | 29% (N=19) | 82% (N=53) |
| Percentage of observations where notice, if available, is outside of the required 30-day period | 100% (N=19) | 70% (N=37) |

## Planning policy relies on exemptions to comply with CEQA, but local rules require additional studies.

State law provides that if a development approval is discretionary, CEQA applies. With a few exceptions, local law determines whether CEQA applies to classes of housing development by making those housing approvals discretionary. State law, however, allows cities to quicken environmental review for some development. There are statutory exemptions in the California Public Resources Code, and the state's CEQA Guidelines provide for another thirty-three categorical exemptions. For example, a planning department can use the Class 32 infill exemption for an urban infill project to bypass CEQA review if the project satisfies certain conditions. The department must still prepare documentation. But the process is comparatively

faster than more intensive environmental review processes, like an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), within most jurisdictions in the state.

When a project is not categorically exempt, the planning agency conducts an initial study to assess whether there is substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. If it is not clear that the impacts can be mitigated below a significance threshold, a planning agency must prepare an EIR. If there is not substantial evidence of a potentially significant effect on the environment, the agency issues a Negative Declaration (ND). If there is substantial evidence that a project will significantly impact the environment, but the developer can properly mitigate the effects, then the agency issues a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

California law also allows the planning agency to reuse existing EIRs to facilitate "streamlining" some classes of development through the environmental review process. This is called "tiering." Tiering allows the proposed development to satisfy CEQA's requirements by relying on existing EIRs, typically programmatic EIRs associated with a plan, and narrowing the environmental review documents to only those issues that have not been evaluated in a prior EIR that covers the proposed project. Tiering requires a prior environmental review document (generally an EIR) typically connected to a prior large-scale planning approval (usually a General Plan or Specific Plan); however, the source of the document varies. A Community Plan Exemption (CPE), for example, is a tiering-based exemption available to projects consistent with a community plan, General Plan, or zoning. When proposed development satisfies environmental review through tiering, it should theoretically reduce project-level costs for the developer because cities generally pay the costs of the relevant plan- or program-level EIR.[76]

EIRs are uncommon in San Francisco. Most developments benefit from streamlining. San Francisco is like its neighbors in this way, though San Francisco's timeframes are quite different from other neighboring jurisdictions we have studied. One notable change between 2014 - 2017 and 2018 - 2021 is that there are more categorical exemptions in the latter four years. That highlights that San Francisco Planning made a change in planning practice that simplifies and lightens the burden of environmental review for qualifying development—and yet overall, entitlements timelines increased in 2018 - 2021.

[76] Robert Olshansky, *The California Environmental Quality Act and Local Planning*, 62 J. AM. PLAN. ASS'N 313, 319–20 (1996).

*Table 10: CEQA Compliance Pathways*

| Year Entitled and N | Categorical Exemption | Tiering (CPE) | Addendum | MND/ND | EIR | Multiple Pathway | CEQA Unknown* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 (N=24) | 4% | 79% | 4% | 0% | 12% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015 (N=23) | 4% | 56% | 4% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 0% |
| 2016 (N=55) | 16% | 67% | 0% | 11% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| 2017 (N=38) | 3% | 82% | 0% | 3% | 11% | 0% | 3% |
| 2018 (N=31) | 29% | 45% | 3% | 13% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| 2019 (N=29) | 48% | 38% | 0% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 3% |
| 2020 (N=18) | 44% | 17% | 6% | 17% | 17% | 0% | 0% |
| 2021 (N=33) | 52% | 33% | 0% | 9% | 6% | 0% | 0% |

Although San Francisco uses exemptions and tiering to comply with CEQA, local rules, not state CEQA guidelines, also require developers complete additional studies. Developers and planners in interviews and meetings indicated that local law demands that planning require wind and shadow studies. We collected information on whether San Francisco Planning required additional studies for 100 discretionary, non-ADU observations. We found no information about wind studies in San Francisco's public portal, which is noteworthy because wind studies came up frequently in interviews. Also, we note here that Class 32 infill exemptions require Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the 44 observations that satisfied CEQA through a Categorical Exemption, 22 (50%) required additional studies.

- ~18% (N=8) of all observations that benefited from a Categorical Exemption (N=44) also required a Shadow study.
- ~43% (N=19) of all observations that benefited from a Categorical Exemption (N=44) required a Transportation Demand Management study.
- ~11% (N=5) of all observations that used a Categorical Exemption (N=44) required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the 33 observations that satisfy CEQA through a Community Plan Exemption, 24 (72%) required additional studies.

- ~32% (N=11) of all observations that used CPE (N=33) also required a Shadow study.
- ~70% (N=23) of observations that used a CPE (N=33) also required a Transportation Demand Management study.

- ~30% (N=10) of all observations that used a CPE (N=33) required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

One observation (out of two) that complied with CEQA through a CEQA Addendum required a Transportation Demand Management study. Neither project required a Shadow Study.

Out of the 12 observations that required a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, 10 (83%) required additional studies.

- ~33% (N=4) of all observations that required a ND or MND (N=12) required a Shadow Study.
- ~67% (N=8) of all observations that required a ND or MND (N=12) required a Transportation Demand Management study.
- ~17% (N=2) of all observations that used an ND/MND (N=12) to satisfy CEQA required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the six observations that required an Environmental Impact Report, 3 (50%) also required a Shadow Study.

## Risk of costly local appeals drives cautious environmental planning practices that limit the impact of the PSA.

In theory, using streamlined environmental review should quicken the planning review process. The PSA sets sixty-day time limits on approving development proposals that qualify for CEQA exemptions and streamlining, once the city makes a determination that the development is exempt from environmental review.[77] But in San Francisco, that is not necessarily true. One possible explanation might be that if environmental determinations always follow other entitlement approvals, using a streamlined environmental review process may have little impact on overall timelines if the other approval steps require more time (though a streamlined process should still reduce costs associated with more intensive environmental planning review).

After reviewing pre-application requirements and notification practices, we explored the data to understand when San Francisco Planning began environmental review and made CEQA determinations. We were able to isolate the environmental review determination or approval date in 95 of our discretionary non-ADU observations. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate what we found: that environmental review determinations almost always happen close to or at the same time as final entitlement decisions under local land use regulation. In 20 of those observations, the environmental determination and approval date is also the latest approval. For the remaining observations in this group, environmental determinations or approvals are often close to the final entitlement date. For 21 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most seven days before the final approval date. For 36 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most 30 days before the final approval date. For 48 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most 60 days before the final approval date. This is important because of the limitations on entitlement review timeframes that the PSA imposes but, as noted, the clock begins to run after Planning prepares environmental review documents, not before. Because environmental determinations occur so close to the end of the entitlement period, the PSA seems to have little effect on overall entitlement timeframes.

[77] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65950 (West 2023).




*Figure 4: CEQA Milestone Timelines Categorical Exemptions Only (2018 - 2021)*




*Figure 5: CEQA Milestone Timelines Multiple Pathways (2018 - 2021)*

Commissioners, planners, and developers all agreed that CEQA slows approvals, and all—including planners and Commissioners—expressed concerns about CEQA abuse. During interviews and meetings with these stakeholders, we asked why environmental review takes as long as it does, as most development in San Francisco is categorically exempt from environmental review or benefits from a streamlined CEQA process. Developers believe San Francisco Planning is too slow to assign environmental planners to projects. Commissioners believe planners are overly cautious because they fear judicial scrutiny. In contrast, planners from multiple departments shared that there are two features of local rules that extend environmental review: (1) local rules requiring further studies add more work, and (2) administrative appeals, or the risk of administrative appeals, to the Board of Supervisors[78] steers planning practice and influences how long review takes overall.

On the second point, planners elaborated that because it is easy to appeal planning approvals, the risk of appeal influences planning practices. For environmental review, both Commissioners and planners perceive that there is a high risk that project opponents will challenge projects by

[78] State law governs much of the requirements for administrative appeals of CEQA determinations (*see* CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21151(c) (West 2023); CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15025(b) (West 2023)) but local rules require that the filing deadline for an administrative appeal of a CEQA determination begins to run only after final entitlement decisions under local land use regulation.

challenging environmental determinations. What is most striking about the difference between Commissioner and planner perspectives is that Commissioners believe planners are worried about judges, but planners expressed confidence that their work would survive judicial scrutiny. Instead, planners expressed concerns regarding the Board of Supervisors.

Planners shared that even if most administrative appeals are withdrawn or denied, the beginning of an appeal creates more work for planning staff members managing environmental review. That additional work changes the pace of all environmental planning reviews for all projects because the projects that face an administrative appeal change review priorities. Also important, the experience of the administrative appeal for planners during the administrative appeal hearing influences their approach to work, overall. The risk of an appeal makes planners more conservative and risk-adverse in their work. One notable trend in interviews and meetings with planners was that planners appeared much more apprehensive of the Board of Supervisors than potential litigants. One planner also stated that, when elected, political bodies are highly critical of planning staff work within a public hearing. This can be demoralizing and impacts the department's working culture.

We reviewed our data across 2014 - 2021 to determine the rate of administrative appeal (inclusive of CEQA-related appeals and other appeals). At least 14% of the approvals in our data (2014 - 2021) faced administrative appeals. We say *at least* 14% because we are not certain that we have located all records on local administrative appeals, as the city does not make past records on administrative appeals readily available online. It is also true that most of the appeals we could locate are denied or withdrawn, and most administrative appeals involve challenges to CEQA determinations as well.

San Francisco Planning's environmental planning division also tracks administrative appeals worked on by their team. This log captures appeals of residential and non-residential entitlements. We reviewed their log of staff hours spent on administrative appeals involving CEQA. Twenty out of 48 administrative appeals filed in 2015 - 2021 that San Francisco Planning tracked overlap with our 2014 - 2021 dataset. Of these 20, the internal department data offers information on cost and time for 19 of our observations. Although the other appeals are not for multi-family housing development, planners shared that these appeals also influence how planners work on housing entitlements. Out of the 20 administrative appeals associated with entitlements in the CALES dataset, San Francisco Planning data indicates that 11 (55%) were denied, five (25%) were withdrawn, only one was upheld, and three were closed with no other details.[79]

San Francisco Planning reports that it logged a total of 5,680.75 hours because of all 48 administrative appeals related to CEQA that they tracked from 2015 - 2021. San Francisco Planning logged a total of 3,031.25 additional staff hours to prepare for CEQA-related administrative appeals associated with entitlements in the CALES database. Translating these hours into days, we find that on average, planners add about 20 days of work per year to their workload to deal with CEQA-related administrative appeals for housing entitlements.

[79] This is consistent with what San Francisco Planning reports for all of the administrative appeals.

*Table 11: Total Time Spent on All CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 N=48*

| (days) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Time Related to Admin. Appealed | 0.56 | 8.69 | 71.06 | 15.11 | 14.92 |

*Table 12: Total Time Spent on CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 for CALES Observations*

| (days) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Time Related to Admin. Appealed | 1.88 | 12.78 | 71.06 | 19.94 | 18.05 |

Administrative appeals add costs to the developer in lost time and higher holding costs, but there are also direct costs to the city associated with the work to prepare for an appeal, even if the appeal is withdrawn. San Francisco Planning reported that all administrative appeals related to CEQA cost the city a total of $793,993 in the years where San Francisco tracked the data (2015-2021). Administrative appeals related to CEQA and associated with entitlements in the CALES dataset (2015-2021) cost the city a total of $421,314. One entitlement in our dataset, 1500-1540 Market Street,[80] required 374 additional staff hours and $52,204 in costs to San Francisco Planning to prepare for the appeal—even though the appeal was withdrawn.

*Table 13: Total Cost CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 (N=48)*

| (USD) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Cost Related to Admin. Appeals | $535 | $10,245 | $81,558 | $16,893 | $16,860 |

*Table 14: Total Cost CEQA Appeals CALES Housing Only (N=19)*

| (USD) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Cost Related to Admin. Appeal | $2,167 | $13,741 | $81,558 | $22,174 | $20,501 |

[80] This is a 100% market-rate mixed-use development that satisfied the inclusionary program with an in-lieu fee.

During interviews and meetings, we also learned that San Francisco Planning has undertaken substantial internal work to address at least some part of this problem by consolidating what is presently six steps in the planning review and permitting into three steps. The aim is to bring the process from application through permitting into one department and facilitate one appeal period for project proponents. It is unclear, however, how these proposed operational changes would address post-entitlement appeals, if at all.

## Continuances—possibly meant to avoid later challenges through administrative appeal—are frequent.

According to stakeholders, changes to the proposed development might appear voluntary but result from negotiations outside of hearings facilitated by Planning staff (who are mediating between project proponents and opponents) before a scheduled Planning Commission hearing. The negotiation is meant to facilitate Planning Commission approval, but developers report that what developers end up agreeing to can render a project infeasible. This is another perception that is difficult to verify through government documents, as there would be no written record of negotiations occurring informally before a scheduled hearing. Stakeholders suggested we look for continuances, or a frequency of continuances and multiple hearings, as evidence of this outcome.

We have 93 discretionary, non-ADU observations that required quasi-adjudicative hearings (but not legislative action). All 93 observations have *some* information about hearings, but only about half have complete information about hearings. Still, approximately 22% (N=20) of these observations, inclusive of observations that do not require public hearings under local zoning and planning law, have multiple hearings or continuances associated with a single approval step. One of the entitlements with multiple hearings had multiple hearings related to CEQA approvals. Another two observations were related to density bonus approvals only—one related to the local program and the other to State Density Bonus Law. Nine observations had more than three continuances or hearings for a single approval step. One of these observations (out of nine) is a discretionary building permit project (with no request for exceptional DR), which utilized San Francisco's local density bonus program, HOME-SF, for approval. The two continuances and one hearing for this observation were associated with the approval of the local density bonus program. This building permit project's application date was 3/3/2020, and San Francisco Planning approved it on 5/13/2021. Three observations required five or more hearings for approval. One of these projects had nine continuances for the same approval step. It is also possible that the rate of multiple hearings for a single approval step *might be higher* than what the data currently reveals—as interviews suggest. Our ability to verify these statements against hearing-related data is contingent on San Francisco Planning making the data publicly available.

When we analyze our data overall, we find that the density proposed is greater than density in final approval for 23 observations. Four (out of 23) observations are associated with a continuance. Another two (out of the 23) are associated with an administrative appeal.

## Publicly Initiated Exceptional DR occurs frequently and may foster negotiations outside of public hearings.

San Francisco uniquely allows an interested party to request the Planning Commission exercise exceptional DR, which involves the Planning Commission "effectively taking a second look at the proposed project." This occurs even when the zoning and planning code do not require a

hearing in front of the Planning Commission, but where an interested member of the public states there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that warrant a public hearing.

There was not a consensus across stakeholder groups on the impact of this policy. Most of the city personnel and Planning Commissioners we spoke to through HCD-led meetings expressed perceptions that the ability to request exceptional DR is primarily, if not almost entirely, associated with disputes between neighbors relating to modifications or smaller developments (like single-family dwellings). These groups did not perceive exceptional DR as a dominant obstacle to multifamily development but as helpful to mediating smaller disputes between neighbors, even if it might take too much of the Planning Commission's time. San Francisco Planning shared their log of staff hours to support exceptional DR hearings between 2014 - 2021. Exceptional DR adds fees to all permits to support this process; the department collects between $750,000 - $1 million per year in permitting fees to support staff time for the exceptional DR process.

When we examine data on the staff hours logged to support exceptional DR, we find that between 2014 – 2021, San Francisco Planning had to allocate ~1,872 full days (8 hours per day) or ~7 business years (262 days at 8 hours per day) to additional work to respond to exceptional DR requests. But only about 4% of those hours were spent on exceptional DR requests associated with the multifamily housing entitlements in our dataset. From the perspective of staff who manage that work, the number of work hours dedicated to addressing exceptional DR hearings, generally, may make the same work for multi-family housing seem minimal compared with the work hours spent addressing all other exceptional DR requests. This may influence staff and Commissioner perceptions of whether DR burdens developers proposing multifamily housing.

But we also found that across almost all participants in confidential research interviews (where HCD was not present), regardless of the stakeholder group, exceptional DR was a dominant issue. The only interview participants that did not to bring up DR were those participants that self-described as only having worked with large-scale phased developments. Interview participants raised the topic of DR as a key obstacle to housing production and described the Planning Code Section 311 neighborhood notification process associated with a discretionary building permit, and potential for a request for DR and related hearing, as an opportunity to oppose entitlement on the eve of approval. Stakeholders described this provision as offering an early "appeal" of a planning approval for smaller or mid-size code compliant buildings. These participants also shared that even the request for DR could result in a change to the project that results in something that is no longer financially feasible to build.

Some stakeholders also shared that opposition comes from different types of neighbors; some are interested in the impacts on their own properties, but others use this process to address neighborhood-level concerns. In the latter context, stakeholders share that frequent project-level adjudications are the consequence of inequitable zoning and planning. The DR provision also came up in interviews when parties discussed the suggested reforms laid out in the recent housing element. Some city personnel that expressed support for proposed rezoning, specifically upzoning in more affluent areas, also predicted that upzoning without eliminating DR in certain neighborhoods would result in project opponents effectively using DR to delay housing development. In terms of its use, there are publicly initiated requests for DR for 19% of the discretionary building permits in our 2018 - 2021 data and 21% in the 2014 - 2017 data—for a combined rate of 20% across eight years for building permits only. We also know that the developments that require exceptional DR take comparatively longer to entitle, as well. The frequency with which exceptional DR comes up for code compliant multi-family housing (relative

to other code compliant multifamily housing) might explain why different stakeholder groups have such different perspectives on the same procedural rule, in terms of its influence on entitlement timelines generally.

In our 2018 - 2021 data, 35% of all variances also had hearings for exceptional DR. There were also another two requests for exceptional DR associated with discretionary ADU observations. One of the requests for exceptional DR was withdrawn. The Planning Commission heard the second request and granted DR. There are an additional two requests associated with approvals that already went before the Planning Commission—but the Planning Commission heard both requests for exceptional DR (and denied them).[81]

During interviews, stakeholders reported that once a party requests DR, Planning Staff (to mediate between the project proponent and the party requesting DR) might verbally ask the developer to change the proposed development to incentivize the party requesting DR to withdraw their request. We cannot verify this through the available entitlement data, however.

We explored the data to find instances of requests for DR being associated with developments that change in size (measured by units) over time. We did come across two proposals to develop five or more units through the local ADU ordinance that resulted in tenant requests for DR, though both would later be withdrawn. The first development that would lead to a tenant request for DR involved a request for five ADUs that required a variance. The Zoning Administrator approved a variance for three units, and a later revised approval document states the proposal changed from five to three units. The request for DR occurred after the variance approval, but before the later revision—though there is nothing that indicates there is a relationship between the request for DR and the later revision to the proposed number of units. In the request for DR, the tenants complain that the approved ADUs would interfere with parking both temporarily and permanently. The tenants also detail an ongoing dispute with the project proponent, their failed attempts to initiate mediation, and their failed efforts to delay final permitting.

Another DR request involved a proposal to build nine ADUs, but a building permit was ultimately issued for just six units. This project involved no special discretionary approval step, so it is even more difficult to determine why the proposal changed over time. The DR documents indicate that the organization that requested exceptional DR initiated the request because of concerns about the impact of the ADUs on parking, and the specific impact on a family with a child with a disability. The request for DR was ultimately withdrawn. Again, there is no data that directly links the reduction from nine to six units to the DR request; the DR request only indicates an ongoing dispute with tenants over parking impacts related to an accessibility and disability issue.

## Developers report that design guidelines are vague and invite subjective conditions of approval.

Planners and developers describe design guidelines as highly subjective, allowing for random outcomes, problematic, and wielded as a “weapon.” Many stakeholders report that the design guidelines are not about design; they are about anticipating complaints from neighbors around light, air, “inches or feet” in setbacks, and related features within development that trigger complaints from neighbors, and satisfying neighbors.

[81] One of these observations required a CUA and the other required a zoning map amendment.

Planners shared that although the guidelines are not part of the Planning Code, they are codified in a roundabout way through a cross reference to the Planning Code. For example, Section 311(c)(1) of the Planning Code provides that Residential Design Guidelines shall be used to review plans for all new construction and alterations of existing residential buildings in R Districts. According to the Planning Department, "The Residential Design Guidelines (Guidelines) articulate expectations regarding the character of the built environment and are intended to promote design that will protect neighborhood character, enhancing the attractiveness and quality of life in the City."[82]

Importantly, developments that comply with the Planning Code but do not conform to the Guidelines end up back in deliberative processes, and sometimes back in front of planning staff, even when they have completed planning review and secured entitlement. Planners, developers, and architects note, however, that the subjectivity in the Guidelines makes this an inevitable outcome. Also, in the context of discretionary building permits, the design guidelines raise issues that often lead to requests for exceptional DR as well.

The Guidelines are filled with requirements that on their face allow for subjective interpretation through words like "compatible," "respect," and "character." Examples include, "In areas with a defined visual character, design buildings to be *compatible* with the patterns and architectural features of surrounding buildings." Explanatory text mandates that designers in areas of "mixed visual character" "draw on the *best* features of surrounding buildings" and "design buildings to help define, unify and contribute positively to the existing visual context." *Site Design* guidelines are also often subjective, requiring, for example, that designs "*[r]espect* the topography of the site." Guidelines addressing *Building Scale and Form* intend to ensure design is "*compatible* with that of surrounding buildings." Scale of buildings must be "*compatible*" in terms of height and depth of surrounding buildings, as well as with the "scale at the street" and mid-block open spaces. Building forms, facades, proportions, and rooflines must be "*compatible*" with those of existing buildings.

## Cumulative and unique procedural hurdles create comparatively long entitlement timelines.

We explored our 2014 - 2017 data to run a comparative analysis with neighboring cities where we had similar data. Importantly, our 2014 - 2017 dataset indicates that entitlement timelines were generally *shorter* than in 2018 - 2021. Still, 2014 - 2017 timelines were longer than other jurisdictions. We searched our data to match observations from our 2014 - 2017 data with similar entitlements in Oakland, Berkeley, and Redwood City, looking for the best matches across the following characteristics:

- Same neighborhood characteristics (defined by 2019 Tax Credit Allocation Committee maps; we do not match high resource neighborhoods with low resource neighborhoods);
- Either for sale or for rent (in other words, we do not compare for sale developments to for rent developments);
- Around the same size (plus or minus five units). They need to have the same income characteristics (either all market-rate, all mixed-income, or all 100% affordable developments); and

[82] *Residential Design Guidelines*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/residential-design-guidelines (Mar. 4, 2020).

- Similar local process characteristics (we do not compare a code compliant development that also benefited from a CPE with a non-code compliant development that required a conditional use permit or variance but also benefited from a CPE).

We use these criteria based on several assumptions about neighborhood-level politics across all cities. For example, we assume the political context varies across neighborhood types (in terms of income level). We also assume that neighborhood opposition might vary based on project type (for sale condos versus for rent apartments, and affordable versus market-rate). The last criterion (process steps) is the most difficult for us to match because no two study cities have identical regulatory environments. We therefore looked for equivalencies within local processes based on whether a development required special approvals or not.

We were unable to find matches in Berkeley and Redwood City. We found that the average difference between all San Francisco-Oakland pairs is 1,086 days (~3 years). The difference in timelines appeared related to San Francisco's pre-application requirements and exceptional DR process.

*Table 15: Comparison of Entitlements Requiring CPEs Oakland-San Francisco 2014 - 2017 data*

| Address Jurisdiction | Project Size (units) and Type | 2019 TCAC Classification | Neighborhood (Name) | Affordability | Compliance with IZ (SF) | Required Local Approvals | Timeframe to Entitlement (days) | Difference in Timeframes [83] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1924 Mission San Francisco | 11 units for rent | Low Resource | Mission | Market-Rate (possibly 1 1-bedroom affordable unit)[84] | On-site | Discretionary Code Compliant (Building Permit only) | 1,203 days | – |
| 3253 Ettie St. Oakland[85] | 9 units for rent | Low Resource | Clawson | Market-Rate | N/A | Discretionary Code Compliant (Design Review only) | 348 days | 855 days |
| 7540 Macarthur Oakland | 11 units for rent | Low Resource | Eastmont Hills | Market-Rate | N/A | Discretionary Code Compliant (Design Review only) | 51 days | 1,152 days |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 198 Valencia St. San Francisco | 28 units for rent | Low Resource | SoMa | Market-Rate | Unknown | Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review | 1,302 days | – |
| 3129 Elmwood | 30 units for rent | Low Resource | Jingletown | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 150 days | 1,152 days |

[83] Only populated for Oakland projects. This column shows the many more days it took for the Oakland project to entitle, relative to its matched San Francisco project.
[84] There is an August 2018 One Unit Compliance with Inclusionary Housing Program Affidavit that provides that one of the one-bedroom units would be affordable—but we could not locate a deed restriction in PIM.
[85] It looks like the developer successfully secured excavation, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing building permits post-entitlement in 2018, but those expired in 2019 and 2020.

| Address Jurisdiction | Project Size (units) and Type | 2019 TCAC Classification | Neighborhood (Name) | Affordability | Compliance with IZ (SF) | Required Local Approvals | Timeframe to Entitlement (days) | Difference in Timeframes [83] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oakland | | | | | | | | |
| 956 63rd St. Oakland | 28 units for rent | Low Resource | Paradise Park | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 105 days | 1,197 days |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 645-647 Valencia St, San Francisco | 7 units for rent | Moderate Resource | Mission | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review | 1,435 days | – |
| 4429 Piedmont, Oakland | 9 units for rent | Moderate Resource | Piedmont Avenue | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 137 days | 1,289 days |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 2201 Market San Francisco | 17 units for rent | Low Resource | Mission | Market-Rate | Fee | Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review | 1,160 days | – |
| 5325 San Pablo Oakland | 17 units for rent | Low Resource | Gaskill | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 287 days | 873 days |

## Stakeholders report that San Francisco's policy emphasizes project-level adjudication to achieve equitable development outcomes, when what the city needs to achieve equitable development outcomes is zoning and planning reform.

The comparatively longer timeframes in San Francisco are associated with processes that illustrate a larger, complex, and recurring theme that dominated several interviews with developers, planners, and affordable housing advocates. From the table above, we pull out the entitlement at 1924 Mission to explain what stakeholders report—San Francisco's current policy attempts to resolve neighborhood-level concerns about inequitable land use development through project-level adjudication rather than more equitable planning and zoning.

1924 Mission Street involved a proposal to construct an 11-unit building with ground-floor retail on a site with an auto body shop. The project proponent submitted a required PPA in March 2014.[86] This pre-application process required submitting an application for assessment with the site plan, floor plan, building elevations, and photographs. This PPA process also required

[86] This is a required process applicable (at the time) to all proposed developments of seven or more units. San Francisco has since modified applicability; it is required for developments of 10 or more units, creation or expansion of group housing using 10,000 square feet or more, and unspecified "other complex projects." *Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA)*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/ppa-application (July 11, 2023).

notice to the neighborhood[87] and a pre-application neighborhood meeting. The pre-application neighborhood meeting is supposed to identify neighborhood grievances and prevent requests for exceptional Discretionary Review.[88] Importantly, developers state that these pre-application processes do *not* achieve that end, and this example is consistent with those perceptions.

The Planning Department issued a Certificate of Determination on April 2, 2015, that the project qualified for a CPE (tiering). According to the Notice of Building Permit Application, the project proponent then applied for discretionary building permits on May 23, 2016.[89] The Planning Department issued the Notice of Building Permit Application on March 20, 2017.

A local neighborhood organization applied for the Planning Commission to take exceptional Discretionary Review on April 19, 2017. The application for exceptional Discretionary Review provided that the neighborhood organization requesting review believed the proposed development was inconsistent with the General Plan's policy priority that "[t]hat existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods."[90] The application for Discretionary Review stated that proposed rents would be high, and expressed concern that "gentrification-inducing design, intended to target higher-end tenants, will create local upward price pressure on surrounding tenants."[91]

Importantly, the neighborhood organization expressed concerns that this proposed development was one of several that created harm in the neighborhood. The applicant noted that the harm was related to "the cumulative impact of this and the other seven projects proposed for the immediate vicinity of Mission St."[92] The request for Discretionary Review asked that the Planning Commission consider the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed development and other developments and "demand this project alter its appearance in order that it comes into line with neighboring buildings on the Mission corridor in a way that better helps 'preserve the cultural and economic diversity' of the corridor and the Mission District."[93]

The Planning Commission heard this request on July 6, 2017. The Planning Commission agreed that there were "extraordinary and exceptional circumstances" that warranted Discretionary Review and that "project refinements were necessary to address concerns over the project's compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood." The Planning Commission conditioned the building permit approval on the following grounds: the ground floor retail space needed to be designated for trade shop use, the project proponent needed to explore providing a mural on one wall, and the project proponent needed to "work with Planning Department staff on refin[ing] the exterior design to provide a stronger relationship to the surrounding context." The Building Department issued a demolition permit to demolish the auto body shop in August

---

[87] The notice requirements for the Pre-Application Meeting demanded notification to all property owners within a 300 feet radius, all relevant neighborhood organizations, and anyone who requested notice. Meetings may only be held during certain hours, and project proponents must keep a record of all attendees.
[88] The first page of the Pre-Application Meeting Packet logged in PIM provides: "The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed."
[89] There is no Project Application logged in PIM.
[90] This language comes from the Application for Discretionary Review, page 4, logged in PIM.
[91] Id.
[92] Id.
[93] Id.

2019 and a temporary shoring permit for an empty lot in 2021. DBI's Permit Tracking system seems to indicate review of plans through spring of 2021, but no activity is logged after that.[94] It is also unclear how the final project-specific conditions of approval resolve the larger, neighborhood level concerns about gentrification and displacement raised during this request for exceptional Discretionary Review—which are at least in part related to the city's zoning and planning that dictates where developers may build multi-family housing citywide.

## Planners and developers believe San Francisco needs procedural reform that addresses discretionary review, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors agree.

Stakeholders explained that three features of San Francisco's local law invite project-by-project adversarial politics that will prevent San Francisco from meeting housing production targets and equitable housing outcomes: (1) density and use controls that limit development to specific neighborhoods, (2) procedural law and policy that renders all approvals discretionary, and (3) charter provisions that allow project opponents to appeal multiple post-entitlement construction permits.

When discussing SB 35, affordable developers and planners explained the state ministerial process resolved the second issue without touching the first or third. SB 35 may fix planning review for eligible projects, but it cannot fix San Francisco's housing production pipeline because two major impediments to production remain. (SB 35 also only applies because San Francisco has failed to meet its RHNA targets—which is not the city's aim.)

According to planners, developers, and many housing advocates, achieving production targets, affordability, and equity demand long-range planning, rezoning for density in higher opportunity areas in conjunction with a *local* ministerial approval process, and charter reform to limit post-entitlement appeals. Some planners shared that a local ministerial process would have more legitimacy with community members than a state ministerial process; legitimacy that planners perceive as important within San Francisco because of the city's poor track record in prior decades of engaging with certain neighborhoods and low-income communities. But many stakeholders, including planners, shared their belief that current and proposed local procedural reforms, including the Mayor's Housing for All Executive Directive, are insufficient to remove policy constraints on production. According to these stakeholders, current reforms merely "tinker" with the planning code while leaving blanket discretionary review and the administrative appeal process intact. Stakeholders who shared this perspective stated plainly that they think the Mayor's Office can only do so much to fix these issues—the real fix depends on the Board of Supervisors and possibly the electorate. There were a handful of stakeholders who emphasized that the Mayor's Office must lead in addressing problems with permitting and felt entitlement processes were not the problem.

Every stakeholder that shared that San Francisco needs a local ministerial process and charter reform also felt accomplishing either one is politically impossible. Several planners expressed a belief in the need for state intervention—but not necessarily a preference for state intervention. Interview participants across several stakeholder groups emphasized that local processes that require the most reform are intertwined with values and assumptions about what these

[94] It is difficult to ascertain much more than the status of a permit from building permit data.

procedural rules offer in terms of stakeholder engagement, historic and cultural preservation, and ultimately, spatial equity.

Several planners also explained that San Francisco has inadequately engaged community around planning and zoning for decades. There was a consensus among planners that recent efforts by Supervisors to connect with low-income communities around land use still lack sufficient and intentional community engagement. Planners also described a need for the city to mend relationships with community through acknowledgment of and documentation of past harms. Some affordable developers echoed these concepts when they described how some neighborhoods continue to have the city's legacy of racism codified in neighborhood association covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&R).

Planning staff and some housing advocates explained that it is not in the city's best interests to keep existing processes as they are if the city's goal is to redress these past harms and increase housing production in an equitable way. But because process requirements are framed as key to stakeholder engagement and participation, planners believe no local political body wants to dismantle them. Process in San Francisco is sacrosanct. Consistent with this perspective from planners, some Commissioners emphasized the importance of engagement, but Commissioners focused on engagement during the project entitlement phase. The difference in how stakeholder groups described the need for community engagement in relationship to planning, zoning, and project development is significant. Planners discussed a need for engagement at larger scales and at the legislative level, to facilitate equitable planning and zoning, not just at the project-level. Commissioners focused on engagement at the project-level.

Interview participants also elaborated and described existing density and use controls and project-level adjudication as reflecting how power over land use is inequitably distributed citywide. Certain neighborhoods wield enough power over political bodies to block changing density and use controls, so no multifamily housing is proposed in the first instance. These constituents who benefit most from the spatial distribution of density and use controls do not need to attend public hearings to block housing development. Developers propose dense multifamily housing (and affordable housing) where housing may be built under zoning and planning standards.[95] That leaves communities in the neighborhoods where zoning allows housing to be built with one primary pathway to access power over land use; they must go through project-level adjudication, or public hearings. Some neighborhoods have built up power over time and can now effectively block all development through project-level adjudication. Other neighborhoods have more recently begun advocating for community needs through project adjudication. Planners also described alliances between wealthy residents and community activists with less money and influence that are working to protect their communities from harm from what they perceive to be the "greedy developer."

Stakeholders explained that project-level adversarial politics may seem responsive to inequitable land use patterns because it allows communities to advocate for what they need, but

[95] These perspectives were consistent with what we discovered in earlier research on San Francisco's zoning, reviewing zoning neighborhood planning between 1921 (beginning with the 1921 San Francisco Building Zone Ordinance, and reviewing 1948, 1979 and 1990 zoning) through the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan adopted in 2009. We found that the entitlements for 5 or more units issued in 2014 - 2017 were concentrated almost entirely in neighborhoods that had zoning for multi-family housing in place since at least 1921 (the Mission) or in neighborhoods that may have been zoned industrial neighborhoods but later rezoned for mixed-use (such as SoMa and Potrero Hill).

this approach fails to change power imbalances or solve for structural inequities. Neighborhoods that have prevented density (through zoning and planning standards) remain unavailable for development. Other neighborhoods feel perpetually burdened. When project opponents from vulnerable neighborhoods cannot stop an approval, they also interpret the entitlement as signaling that political bodies do not care about their neighborhood's needs[96] even though planners state that the opposite is true. Planners believe that the Planning Commission cares very deeply about neighborhood needs. From the perspective of planners, it is because the Commissioners care deeply about neighborhood needs that they slow or block housing approvals.

Planners shared local rules do too little to facilitate meaningful public input into design because the local rules without state intervention lead to just one conversation about how the city may deny the proposed development. Planners perceive that soliciting meaningful community input into design does not happen until political bodies and neighbors accept a project approval is imminent. Only then, according to planners, does the entitlement process facilitate community input to make the design better and prevent unintended harm the neighborhood. But planners report that at present productive dialogue to allow for community input depends entirely on state law that intervenes in local discretion in some way, and that the current local regulatory framework provides an inefficient and slow means to achieve housing production sensitive to neighborhood needs.

Participants in confidential research interviews cautioned that proposals to rezone need to be coupled with local ministerial processes or the rezoning will leave the existing inequities in place. Planners predict that any rezoned neighborhoods that have not welcomed dense housing in the past will use San Francisco's procedural law to block development if rezoning is not coupled with a ministerial approval process. Affordable developers share this perspective. Also, planners believe a local ministerial process would require all parties to pay more attention to the requirements of the code, which would better achieve more predictable and desired housing outcomes. Many planners and housing advocates said that disrupting this structural imbalance of power requires the kind of procedural overhaul that challenges entrenched beliefs about what current discretionary processes offer, which these stakeholders believe makes local procedural reform politically impossible. Planners believe the ideological divide within political bodies limits legislative proposals; planners believe Supervisors are limited to developing legislation that Supervisors believe will get passed,[97] which may or may not result in effective reform. Nonetheless, there was an unequivocal consensus among planners and affordable developers that San Francisco needs major procedural reform because not all neighborhoods welcome affordable housing development.

Although within stakeholder groups there was agreement on these topics, there was no consensus across stakeholder groups on any of these points. Planners and developers (including affordable developers) agree that San Francisco needs substantial local process reform that removes some discretion, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors share this perspective. During meetings with HCD, some Commissioners and Supervisors' perceptions clearly aligned with planners and developers on the relationship between zoning, procedural rules, and substantive standards on development and inequities across neighborhoods. These

[96] During interviews, one development noted as illustrative was 792 Capp Street, which required a Conditional Use Authorization to demolish a single-family dwelling to build four units; the CUA hearing was continued seven times before entitlement.

[97] Supervisor Melgar's public statements during the hearing on June 1, 2023, where she states her recommendations are to help ensure that the Housing Element gets passed, reflect a similar perspective.

participants acknowledged the challenges with existing discretionary review and administrative appeals of post-entitlement permits, and articulated these rules as potential constraints on supply and affordability. These Commissioners and Supervisors explained the difficult tradeoffs political bodies grapple with when developing or amending procedural rules, but they did acknowledge a need for legal reform.

Other Commissioners and Supervisors, however, expressed entirely different perceptions. Some Commissioners and Supervisors emphasized the importance of maintaining discretionary review while proposing that reforms should promote faster, more predictable processes. Some Supervisors characterized San Francisco's political bodies as consistently inclined to approve most proposals for housing and stated that all neighborhoods welcome affordable housing (though they did not distinguish between neighborhood groups responding to proposals to build affordable housing and their own voting records on affordable housing). The perspectives of some Supervisors on the topic of affordable housing sharply contrasted with what both affordable developers and planners shared. Affordable developers stated that many San Francisco neighborhoods do not welcome affordable development and residents are concerned about more units or taller buildings, generally. Affordable developers also perceived the west side of the city as particularly unwelcoming of affordable development.

Some Supervisors also shared their skepticism about the need for market-rate housing supply to address the city's housing issues, and their belief that inadequate funding for subsidized housing was the primary obstacle to addressing the city's housing needs.[98] While affordable developers and planners agreed that more state funding is critical for San Francisco to develop needed affordable housing, affordable developers and planners also called out local policy obstacles to production (including post-entitlement problems). In sum, affordable developers see funding and regulatory reform as both essential to increasing affordable development, whereas some Supervisors critique the latter as an approach to solving the city's housing challenges.

Some Commissioners and Supervisors also expressed deep concerns about state law that they interpreted as punitive, or harmful to local implementation of important aesthetic controls and historic preservation. What also really stood out was the difference between affordable developer and planner perspectives and those of some members of political bodies on the role of state law in accelerating affordable development.

## All stakeholder groups report persistent post-entitlement challenges.

During interviews and meetings, *all* stakeholders, ranging from developers, architects, lawyers, and planners, complained of persistent challenges post-entitlement. Some of the dominant concerns related to the lack of uniformity in post-entitlement permitting. These stakeholders perceive that permitting depends on who is assigned to the process rather than on the form or

[98] In the November 15, 2022 hearing on the draft Housing Element, Supervisor Preston, for example, repeatedly stated that the aim of state law is to avoid providing more funding and to instead deregulate market-rate housing as the pathway to increase affordable development. *See S.F. Bd. of Supervisors: Hearing on the Draft Housing Element 2022* (Nov. 15, 2022) (statement of Dean Preston, Supervisor). Supervisor Preston shared these same perspectives in an open letter online, as well. Letter from Dean Preston, Supervisor, S.F. Bd. of Supervisors, to Gustavo Velasquez, Director, Cal. Dep't Hous. & Cmty. Dev. (Aug. 11, 2022), https://56a418ca-94d2-476c-9a45-f491ca4a0387.usrfiles.com/ugd/56a418_6abc98cb39f3429b85a1e3f2fb69fa17.pdf.

requirements of the development. Developers also commented that the system of review, itself, incentivizes extending review timelines. There is also no mechanism to escalate projects to someone with a higher position or a deeper understanding of what the projects require. The fact that there is priority review for affordable development is also negated by the fact that other developers can pay for priority review, so there is no true prioritization in the review process. Developers also shared that the subjectivity in the post-entitlement process can trigger a second stage of planning review even after the development has proceeded to the Department of Building Inspections.

Affordable developers were emphatic that state law, like SB 35, does nothing for post-entitlement challenges. All developers grapple with inadequate interagency coordination during the post-entitlement phase of development that creates duplicative review processes, delays, and inefficiencies. Interviews and meetings also suggest that affordable development may be most impacted. Developers attribute these problems to city departments lacking a production focus, and that no single person or department is sufficiently empowered to monitor the process. One stakeholder described post-entitlement as a “kickball game” with developers going back and forth between departments and personnel. Planners also described problems with permitting processes as at least in part due to a poorly structured operation that lacks adequate policy and transparency, so staff are unaccountable in the way that planning staff are held accountable. Developers shared similar perceptions. Stakeholders describe the lack of an intermediate administrator between DBI and the Building Inspection Commission (an administrator within the city’s executive branch) as a deficiency that contributes to inadequate coordination within and between departments.

Affordable developers shared significant difficulties with utilities processes for affordable development that led to extended periods of no power during and after construction. One developer characterized the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) power requirements as “crippling” for affordable housing development. All developers expressed frustration with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), generally, with some developers describing PG&E as monopolistic and engaged in “political retribution” with SFPUC by imposing infrastructure improvements or deprioritizing projects that go through the SFPUC. Affordable developers also report challenges with poor inter-agency coordination around meeting accessibility requirements, trouble with satisfying public art requirements, and difficulty meeting local hiring requirements because of labor shortages.

Nearly all participants offered their concerns about current efforts to address challenges with DBI and permitting. One frequent comment was that any directive to improve permitting processes (for example, by shortening permitting timelines) depends on having a baseline to make improvements from, but there is no baseline because there is poor data on permitting and no one has managed to track that information.

# Conclusion

We entered this research understanding that San Francisco’s entitlement timeframes were much longer than other jurisdictions. (The state’s Annual Progress Report Data Dashboard would later show that San Francisco self-reported the longest entitlement timeframes across the state.) What remained unclear was *why* retaining discretion over all development creates comparatively longer timeframes in San Francisco. Neighboring jurisdictions in the Bay Area also used discretionary review to approve all multifamily housing as well, but they did not take as long. Oakland, for example, retained discretion over all development of five or more units and

the median timeframe to approval was six months. Redwood City applied discretionary review to similar housing development and required *more* approval steps and the timelines were still shorter. Even entitlement in the City of Berkeley, which requires a use permit for any development, did not take as long as San Francisco. These are findings we could not explain because we did not dive into the details of how different discretionary pathways influenced approval outcomes or timeframes for specific types of multi-family housing.

Our earlier data also made it clear that San Francisco Planning prioritized 100% affordable developments—yet it was also true that affordable development did not move quickly, and the local regulatory environment was not hospitable to affordable housing despite staff efforts to quicken approvals for affordable development. In fact, our interviews from prior years signaled that even as San Francisco Planning prioritized 100% affordable development, local regulation, and local application of environmental review created risk that some affordable developers simply could not manage. Consistent with what interview and meeting participants shared, the 2014 - 2017 housing approvals data revealed there were only five 100% affordable developments entitled in those four years. Nearly three out of every four affordable housing units entitled in 2014 - 2017 depended on mixed-income development, or application of the city's inclusionary program to market-rate housing. It is important to note that before SB 35, increasing affordable housing production depended almost entirely on market-rate developers.

The data we have now, however, offers more insight into what parts of San Francisco's system generate comparatively longer timeframes and why. San Francisco, like so many other cities we have studied, continues to grapple with the consequences of inequitable land use policy from earlier decades. One of the primary tools San Francisco uses to redress past wrongs is process. Thus, like many other cities, San Francisco local law creates a procedural maze for housing entitlement through both zoning and aesthetic regulation. But what the data above tells us is that in San Francisco, the procedural maze is one with walls that move. Provisions within the Business and Tax Code and the city's Charter allow project opponents to repeatedly challenge approvals during and after planning review, and in some instances, impose new conditions of approval. No proposed housing development is immune under local law. This fosters a system of lengthy and repeated negotiations throughout and beyond entitlement.

The state asked whether San Francisco was fully implementing state housing law, and the data indicates that for the most part, the answer is no. This is true despite the diligent work of city personnel to facilitate housing approvals. What came through as a dominant theme in most interviews and meetings with developers was high regard for planning personnel combined with a heightened level of frustration with planning department processes. It was also clear that several Commissioners and Supervisors want to see more housing production, as well.

What exactly about local law blocks full implementation of state law that aims to simplify and quicken process? Stakeholders explained that the same rules which allow for repeated challenge to approvals, including post-entitlement approvals, are what invite subjective conditions of approval and constant negotiation outside of public hearings during the entitlement process. They also report that the risk of administrative appeal to local political bodies drives all planning practice, not just environmental planning practices—although environmental planning is particularly burdened. Though we found that most administrative appeals are withdrawn or denied, we heard that the beginning of an appeal creates more work for planning staff, which in turn changes the pace of all environmental planning review for all projects. All environmental determinations under CEQA occur near the end of the entitlement process (right before or at final entitlement). This practice seems to eviscerate the effects of PSA on timely approvals. If left as is, existing blanket discretionary review and planning practices will likely diminish the

effects of SB 330 as well, which targets excessive continuances and hearings, going forward. That suggests that addressing this problem requires scrutinizing both existing planning practice and the local administrative appeal process. According to most stakeholders we consulted, although many parts of San Francisco's local law need reform, the efficacy of any reform hinges on whether the city can revise its Business and Tax Code and Charter.

San Francisco's application of SB 35 yields the most insight into what legal reforms will likely expedite planning review. SB 35 changed San Francisco's application and intake process for qualifying development. Although the 2018 - 2021 data indicates that San Francisco's application intake process under local law was inconsistent with the PSA, the city regularly complied with SB 35's time constraints on planning review. When discussing what is needed to improve the housing approval pipeline in general, participants in confidential interviews shared that San Francisco needs a local ministerial process that parallels SB 35, to eliminate blanket discretionary review of all permits, thoughtful reform of local administrative appeal processes, and equitable rezoning in low density affluent areas. But no interview participant was optimistic that San Francisco could deliver on these reforms without state intervention in local power.

Also important—there was consensus among several stakeholder groups that communities within San Francisco have been harmed by the city's planning and zoning in the past, but no consensus on how the city should proceed going into the future. There was also no consensus between stakeholder groups, particularly between city staff and city officials, on what housing production would best serve the city's housing needs, on the role of local regulation in enabling or blocking housing production, the role of state law on facilitating housing production, and what the city should do to meet housing need *and* achieve spatial equity.

For example, planners and city personnel discussed the city's RHNA obligations when defining the city's housing problems. Planners described San Francisco land use policy with a wide lens, pulling in developer perspectives, neighborhood needs, and politics when discussing the effects of current policy and planning practice on production outcomes. Also notable, most city staff described how reforms could advance participation goals or spatial justice, but they also described individual policies and planning practices as pieces within a larger system that accounted for law, policy, and cyclical market conditions. Planners and city personnel offered detailed analysis of what is not working that was easy to verify using other data. City staff were clear that local legal reform would be the best solution, but also were not hostile to state laws that addressed some of San Francisco's procedural challenges.

Discussions with members of the political bodies responsible for developing and enacting the local legal reform were very different. All Commissioners and Supervisors agreed that the housing approval process was slow and needed improvement. One Supervisor even went so far as to describe San Francisco's entitlement process as difficult by design. Some Commissioners and Supervisors were also as pragmatic as staff offered robust explanations of how local regulation operates across the city, distinguishing between law and practice and explaining how politics influence planning practice and production outcomes. A few foregrounded specific and precise local legal reforms to support housing production citywide with sensitivity to equity and spatial justice within the city's existing policy framework and current market conditions. Some were deferential to planning staff as experts on what is needed in terms of procedural reform. Some were explicit in their support of program statements in the housing element that call for ministerial processes for at least some development.

But some political participants responded to questions about how policy and planning work within San Francisco with answers focused almost entirely on contributing factors to production

that were outside of the city's purview—like state funding for affordable housing. Some Commissioners focused most on how to improve implementation of the existing rules while retaining discretion in all planning review. There was also a split in how the Commissioners and Supervisors perceived state law, and the housing element process, as well. Some were explicit that they felt the state was penalizing San Francisco through the RHNA process, and that regulatory and practice reform would not resolve the challenges San Francisco is facing.

Thus, what the data also shows is that the primary gatekeepers to local policy reform do not agree with each other or city staff on the scope of San Francisco's housing need or on what the city must to do to meet that need. There is also no agreement on the relative importance of local regulation in creating, perpetuating, or ameliorating the city's housing problems.

## Appendix A: Regression Supplement With Methods

In earlier writing, we found that longer timeframes within a city were not necessarily associated with more approval steps on average. But our analysis compared median timeframes and average local steps to entitlement in one city to another city. We did not explore the potential relationship between timeframes and local steps to entitlement in any single case study city. This analysis, within San Francisco only, is important because at least some procedural reform proposals assume that reducing steps to approval while maintaining discretionary review will shorten timeframes. At the same time, stakeholders describe San Francisco's regulations as creating variability and uncertainty in the approval process, even when a proposed development has few steps to approval.

Generally, within a single city, even if entitlement takes a long time overall, we expect that more approval steps extend timeframes. Theoretically, if a development conforms to existing planning and zoning and requires no local-level approvals, it should take less time than a development that requires one or more special approvals to secure entitlement. San Francisco's local law does provide for dense residential buildings in some neighborhoods, without any special approvals. San Francisco's law also allows dense residential housing in other neighborhoods but with required special approvals. For example, development over a specific height threshold in some areas requires a Conditional Use Authorization or Large Project Authorization. If the local law is operating as we think it should, planning review might take longer when a development requires a Conditional Use Authorization before a building permit than if the development requires only a building permit. Finally, when a property owner proposes development that requires a rezoning or General Plan Amendment, it might take even longer than a project requiring a Conditional Use Authorization because what the developer is proposing is not provided for in existing planning and zoning.

But what we have heard within interviews so far is that this is not how local planning and zoning operates in practice. Most stakeholders described a process where neighbors may oppose any proposed development in any context, and planners are placed in a position of mediating disputes. Because of this, the time to entitlement (and certainty of approval) is unpredictable for all development subject to discretionary review, whether a project conforms to the local planning and zoning or not.

Stakeholders describe informal and formal pre-application processes for initial outreach and meetings to help planners, and the property owners anticipate neighborhood reaction and adjust a proposed development before proceeding through the entitlement application process. They also described a process where planners worked to mediate and resolve potential conflicts before proposals went in front of approval bodies (like the Planning Commission).

But stakeholders also note that although a property owner may begin negotiations with neighbors before the application (and in cases where the Planning Department requires a Preliminary Project Assessment, sometimes before that process), and continue negotiations throughout planning review, project opposition may not manifest until late in the process. They emphasized that smaller buildings are most vulnerable. Therefore, no matter what work the planners and property owners put into anticipating and mediating disputes over proposed projects, the process allows the risk of opposition for new, sometimes unpredictable, reasons to remain. Because opposition can emerge at any time, stakeholders say this makes the timeframes and approval outcomes uncertain.

These statements suggest that we should explore the entitlement data to see if entitlement for code compliant development is associated with shorter timeframes as compared with entitlement that requires special approvals or deviates from planning and zoning. Theoretically, code-consistent development should always move faster. One way we do this is to explore relationships between local steps to entitlement and timeframe to entitlement. If longer timeframes are associated with more approval steps, then policy proposals that focus on eliminating or consolidating approval process steps to expedite housing approvals should help shorten timeframes. But if more approval steps are not associated with longer timeframes, this means that something else is occurring to lengthen timeframes. If that is true, reducing the number of discretionary approval steps, alone, may not resolve the uncertainty and unpredictability stakeholders describe. **Although analyzing our entitlement dataset using regression cannot "prove" or "disprove" what stakeholders have shared, this additional analysis allows us to use more than one method and multiple data points for insights, which is more reliable than relying on only one method or data point.**

We chose to run linear regression models, rather than probability models, because we are interested in understanding what drives project timeframes in San Francisco—not necessarily what drives extreme delays within the context of San Francisco's regulatory environment. If we used a probability model, we would need to generate a binary variable as the dependent variable in our analysis. This variable would distinguish observations that are delayed (in terms of the project timeframe). San Francisco's extraordinarily long entitlement timeframes make this very difficult. For example, generating a binary cutoff for delayed timeframes at the median would lead to a cutoff of 39 months. That means we would be defining observations with incredibly long timeframes as "not delayed" because they were below this median, and then using the probability model to see whether certain factors generate delays beyond 39 months. Since most discretionary projects in San Francisco are delayed, even if they are delayed for less than 39 months, a probability model with a binary dependent variable is not best suited for our analysis. Also, that model would ignore project factors that are associated with two- or three-year timeframes because it would classify these projects as "not delayed."

## Regression Analysis Using 2018 – 2021 Data (OLS Models)

We first analyze the existing associations between local land use approvals[99] required for entitlement in 2018 - 2021 and project timeframes using a multivariable, Ordinary Least Squares Regression (OLS). First, we ran a simple, OLS regression using local land use approval steps as the single independent variable, and timeframes as the dependent variable.

We used the statsmodel Python module to run all regressions in this analysis. We calculated all regression coefficients with robust standard errors (Errors of Order 3 (HC3)) to account for the existence of outliers and other issues within the data such as heteroskedasticity (variation in regression errors across our observations) and provide a small sample correction. Note that if we did not use robust standard errors with a small sample and clustered observation correction, the standard errors of our estimates would be smaller, so the standard errors and subsequent hypothesis testing are conservative.[100]

We observe a positive association between approval steps and timeframes. Interpreting the results of this simple regression, an additional approval step is associated with approximately a four-month increase in timeframes. While this positive association exists, our data suggests that observations with little to no local land use steps can take a long time. From this simple regression, we expect a development requiring a discretionary building permit only to take 32 months. Further, out of the 64 observations with less than a single local land use approval step, 23 observations (~36%) are above the mean (~38.6 months) and 26 observations (~41%) are above the median (~34.9 months) timeframe in San Francisco. While this positive association exists, timeframes are variable, regardless of the number of approval steps.

Even if such a relationship between local land use approval steps and timeframes exists, the magnitude of the relationship is, arguably, small. Meaning, the impact of approval steps on timeframes is small. From this simple regression, an additional approval step is associated with an additional ~3.7 months for approval. Given that the mean timeframe for all 111 observations is ~38.56 months, the impact of an additional approval step on timeframes is minimal.

---

[99] We define local land use approval steps as any discrete approval step required for entitlement under local law, not including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance pathway step.

[100] In regression analysis, the errors are defined by the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable (in this case, project timeframes) and values predicted by the regression specification. Accurate estimation of the uncertainty of OLS-predicted values generally depends on constant errors across observations. However, in this study, we do not assume that error is constant (homoscedasticity). For instance, model error might be larger for observations with substantially longer timeframes (i.e., where projects take two to three times longer than the median timeframe). When we use robust standard errors, we no longer assume that errors are constant across all observations, which can mitigate the impacts of this regression analysis being based on observational data. Further, we are using a small sample correction to mitigate the fact that our universe of observations is relatively narrow and to account for the natural clustering in timeframes that occurs at each local land use approval step.

*Figure 6: Regression 2018 - 2021 Observations (No Controls)*




Figure 6 depicts the simple regression of time frames on local land use approval steps. In this graph, the translucent bounds represent the confidence interval for the regression line. Several observations, however, fall outside the bounds of the confidence interval for the regression line. The confidence interval indicates the uncertainty in our regression estimates. This uncertainty could suggest model misspecification.[101] More specifically, the number of approval steps does not adequately capture the variation in project timeframes. **This model misspecification could suggest that there are unaccounted variables that influence the existing relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes.**

[101] A large confidence interval is also often a function of sample size. In other words, because of a limited amount of data, our regression estimates are uncertain. However, we capture a complete dataset of all discretionary, non-ADU entitlements greater than five or more units in 2018 - 2021. Because of this, we are not making statistical inferences based on a sample, but rather generating quantitative analysis on an entire population (and interpreting our results within the context of this population only). Therefore, theoretically, there is no statistical uncertainty through sampling uncertainty.

We controlled for project characteristics that based on interviews and meetings we assumed might influence the relationship between timeframes and the number of local land use approvals. One such example is affordability thresholds. We heard from planners, Commissioners, and Supervisors that the city wants to prioritize 100% affordable development. To control for affordability, we placed the 111 observations into three categories: market-rate, mixed-income, and 100% affordable. To avoid perfect multicollinearity, we did not include the indicator variable which controls for observations that are market-rate. However, due to the model specification, we are still controlling for all affordability classifications in our regression. Below is the distribution of all 111 discretionary observations, by affordability classification:

1) Market-Rate **(N=55)**
2) Mixed-Income **(N=52)**
3) 100% Affordable **(N=4)**

We also controlled for local process characteristics related to the intensity of the approval process—which is distinct from whether an approval process requires more steps. What we are referring to here is how a project proponent may seek only a Variance, or only a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA), or only a Large Project Authorization—and each may require one approval step, but these approval processes are quite different in terms of what we describe as process intensity. A Variance in San Francisco usually requires approval from the Zoning Administrator without a public hearing (though the public may request a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission through the exceptional Discretionary Review process). A Conditional Use Authorization and Large Project Authorization always requires a hearing in front of the Planning Commission. Interviews reveal, however, that the Planning Commissioners interpret the Housing Accountability Act as not applicable to Large Project Authorizations—and that they have the discretion to deny the Large Project Authorization.

Therefore, we wanted to explore whether the *type* of approval process—not necessarily the number of local land use approval steps—is what influences increases in timeframes. We identified five distinct process categories: Discretionary Building Permit, Variance, CUA & PUD, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations, and Legislative Actions. We want to explore whether observations with a more intense process are associated with longer timeframes and, theoretically, more approval steps. Below is the distribution of all 111 discretionary observations, by process category:

1) Discretionary Building Permit (**N=23)**: The building permit category represents a group of observations that are only discretionary by virtue of the Business & Tax Code provision that renders all government approvals discretionary.

2) Variance Only (**N=17**): These are observations that required a variance for approval. The observations do not require any Conditional Use Authorizations, Large Project Exceptions, or Legislative Actions.

3) CUA & PUD (**N=49**): These are observations that required a Conditional Use Authorization or Planned Unit Development (PUD) Approval. The observations do not require any Large Project Exceptions or Legislative Actions.

4) Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations **(N=15)**: These are observations that required either a Downtown Project Authorization or Large Project Authorization. Interviews and meetings indicate that Large Projects face significant hurdles—because they are disfavored. The issue here though is that these large projects may only require one step, and they theoretically seem to be no different than a CUA if we only consider the process in terms of both the number of approval steps and the approval body. However, the procedural step allows for waivers or exceptions to allow for a large project under the planning code. Though these do not appear to require legislative action, interviews suggest that the Planning Commission eschews these approvals, believes that they are not covered by the Housing Accountability Act, and will deny these approvals. That the Planning Commission interprets the Housing Accountability Act as not applying to the LPAs is something planners dispute, as they think this is a faulty interpretation of state law.

5) Legislative Actions (**N=7**): These are observations that required a local legislative act (Planning Code Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, General Plan Amendment, or Development Agreement) for approval.

To assess the impact of process intensity on approval steps, we translated process intensity and incremental numeric ranking in the following order: Discretionary Building Permit (least intense), Variance Only, CUA & PUD, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations (referred to collectively as Exceptions), Legislative Actions (most intense). After running a simple regression of the number of approval steps on this numeric ranking, we find increasing process intensity is associated with an increase of one approval step (rounded).[102] A project that requires a local legislative act or a development agreement for approval is expected to have three to four more approval steps than a discretionary building permit project. This makes sense, as Development Agreements are often associated with proposals that require multiple approvals. This association is statistically significant at the 1% level. While process intensity and the number of local land use approval steps are related, they are not multicollinear. The correlation coefficient between the numeric translation between process intensity and local land use approval steps is 0.63. In an additional section of this report, we run a correlation heatmap between all independent variables to identify any possible sources of multicollinearity.

We also calculate the variation in the number of approval steps for all process categories. Below is a table that breaks out the quantile distribution of approval steps, by process intensity.

[102] The slope coefficient in the simple regression 0.856.

*Table 16: Variation in Number of Approval Steps, by Process Categories, Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2018 - 2021 (N=111)*

| Process Categorization | Min. Steps | 25th Percentile Steps | **Median Steps** | 75th Percentile Steps | Max. Steps | **Mean Steps** | Standard Steps |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Discretionary Building Permit (N=23)[103] | 0 | 0 | **0** | 0 | 2 | 0.13 | 0.46 |
| Variance (N=17)[104] | 1 | 1 | **1** | 1 | 3 | 1.29 | 0.59 |
| CUA & PUD (N=49)[105] | 1 | 1 | **2** | 2 | 4 | 1.96 | 0.96 |
| Exceptions (N=15)[106] | 1 | 1 | **1** | 2 | 5 | 1.60 | 1.12 |
| Legislative Acts (N=7)[107] | 1 | 3 | **5** | 7 | 9 | 5 | 2.94 |

We highlight this variation to show that process categorizations are not just a categorical grouping of the number of local land use approval steps. For instance, all process categorizations have observations that require a single approval step. However, an observation that requires only a variance is significantly different from an observation that requires only a Large Project Exception. It is because these single approval step processes are so different that we control for process in our analysis.

Finally, we also control for project size and whether the observation was in a vulnerable area. Interviews suggest that larger projects are disfavored. We control for project size (instead of just an LPA or DPA) because some proposed developments benefit from State Density Bonus Law, increasing their size, but they do not necessarily require an LPA or DPA (which is determined in part by location as well). Lastly, we control for location within a priority equity geography because interviews suggest political bodies are sensitive to proposals to build in these areas. These project and neighborhood characteristics can also impact the relationship between local land use approval steps and timeframes.

We completed several regression models to explore whether there is a relationship between number of approval steps and timeframes. Or in other words, does increasing the number of required approval steps create longer entitlement timeframes? **The regression models show that when we control for affordability characteristics, project size, location within a vulnerable geographic area, and intensity of the approval process, there is no**

[103] Out of the 23 discretionary building permit observations, one observation had an additional administrative approval. Another observation required an additional administrative approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval.
[104] There are 13 observations that require only one step or only a variance for approval.
[105] There are 18 observations that require only one step, or only a CUA or PUD for approval.
[106] There are 10 observations that require only one step, or an exception (Downtown Project Authorization or Large Project Authorization) for approval.
[107] There is one observation that required only a legislative act for approval.

**statistically significant association between the number of approval steps and timeframes.**

This outcome supports what stakeholders say to be true in San Francisco—factors outside of law influence timeframes, and there is a lot of uncertainty of how entitlement will unfold in San Francisco no matter what a developer proposes to build. This outcome does not prove that there is no causal relationship between timeframes and approval steps; we cannot account for all confounding variables that influence this relationship. OLS identifies associations within our data only. And we are using observational data, as well. Thus, the data and methods do not allow us to prove or disprove that there is no relationship between number of approval steps and timeframes. **But importantly, the regression findings are consistent with what descriptive statistics and interviews both show—there is no easy entitlement pathway in San Francisco, and factors outside of law appear to influence entitlement outcomes. This tells us that reforms that focus on simplifying discretionary review by reducing the number of steps to approval may be insufficient to address uncertainty and lengthy timeframes to approval.**

## Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 with Controls

Table 17 below shows the association between local land use approval steps and timeframes was numerically smaller and no longer statistically significant after we controlled for affordability, process intensity, and project size. These results indicate that there are factors outside of what the planning and zoning law requires of developers that strongly affect the relationship between approval steps and timeframes.

What Table 17 illustrates is that project size may impact the relationship between approval steps and timeframes in our dataset. When controlling for number of approval steps to understand the relationship between project size and timeframes, an additional unit increase in project size is associated with a 0.021 month increase in timeframes. This relationship is statistically significant at the 5% level.

Another factor that may impact the relationship between approval steps and timeframes is the intensity of the process. An observation requiring a variance or CUA/PUD is associated with an increase in timeframes, relative to a discretionary building permit observation. This relationship is diminished (in terms of significance) but is still present when we add controls. Further, an approval requiring a Large Project Authorization is associated with an increase in timeframes, relative to a discretionary building permit observation—but this association is no longer statistically significant when we add all controls (including project size).

*Table 17: All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021*

| Variables | No Controls | Affordability Controls | Neighborhood Controls | Size Controls | Process Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dependent Variable:** Timeframe (denoted in months) | | | | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 3.693*** | 3.681*** | 3.743*** | 2.794** | 2.761* | 2.360 |
| | (1.244) | (1.353) | (1.260) | (1.117) | (1.637) | (1.755) |
| Market-rate | | 12.706 | | | | 4.160 |
| | | (9.493) | | | | (8.372) |
| Mixed Income | | 12.934 | | | | 6.833 |
| | | (9.242) | | | | (8.970) |
| Vulnerable Area | | | 1.584 | | | 1.307 |
| | | | (3.860) | | | (4.331) |
| Project Size | | | | 0.021** | | 0.028** |
| | | | | (0.011) | | (0.013) |
| Variance | | | | | 19.468** | 20.488** |
| | | | | | (8.799) | (9.149) |
| CUA & PUD | | | | | 12.286*** | 11.115** |
| | | | | | (4.092) | (4.547) |
| Exceptions | | | | | 9.987* | 6.653 |
| | | | | | (5.317) | (6.152) |
| Legis. Acts | | | | | 6.467 | 0.558 |
| | | | | | (9.207) | (11.431) |
| Constant | 32.580*** | 20.246** | 31.714*** | 32.369*** | 23.930*** | 17.656** |
| | (2.653) | (8.889) | (2.854) | (2.587) | (2.567) | (7.260) |
| Observations | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 |
| R-squared | 0.075 | 0.088 | 0.076 | 0.094 | 0.157 | 0.197 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.066 | 0.063 | 0.059 | 0.077 | 0.117 | 0.126 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

## Regression Analysis Using 2014 - 2017 Data

After running a simple regression on approval steps and timeframes using the 2014 - 2017 dataset, we find a positive association between approval steps and timeframes. This association is not statistically significant. In terms of magnitude, the association between local land use approval steps within the 2014 - 2017 dataset is weaker than in the 2018 - 2021 dataset**.**

*Figure 7: Ordinary Least Squares Regression 2014 - 2017 Observations (N=140)*



We also run our regressions on observations that received a Community Plan Exemption (N=100).
We did this to further explore whether local approval steps impact timeframes for projects that satisfy CEQA in the same way.

*Table 18: Regression Using 100 CPE Observations 2014 - 2017*

| Variables | No Controls | Affordability Controls | Neighborhood Controls | Size Controls | Process Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dependent Variable:** Timeframe (denoted in months) | | | | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 3.295 | 3.521 | 3.009 | 4.097 | 4.062 | 2.515 |
| | (2.740) | (3.802) | (2.731) | (2.615) | (7.615) | (6.105) |
| Market-rate | | 15.159*** | | | | 22.226 |
| | | (5.177) | | | | (19.833) |
| Mixed Income | | 12.443* | | | | 23.791 |
| | | (6.614) | | | | (19.983) |
| Vulnerable Area | | | -2.478 | | | -1.423 |
| | | | (3.184) | | | (3.265) |
| Project Size | | | | -0.019 | | 0.002 |
| | | | | (0.022) | | (0.028) |
| Variance | | | | | 4.305 | 3.071 |
| | | | | | (9.589) | (9.902) |
| CUA & PUD | | | | | -5.188 | -6.306 |
| | | | | | (10.667) | (10.416) |
| Exceptions | | | | | -4.053 | -3.885 |
| | | | | | (19.060) | (17.804) |
| Legis. Acts | | | | | 10.918 | 20.784 |
| | | | | | (34.670) | (35.476) |
| Constant | 24.966*** | 11.406** | 26.813*** | 25.232*** | 25.700*** | 6.351 |
| | (3.513) | (5.124) | (4.363) | (3.667) | (2.779) | (19.031) |
| Observations | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| R-squared | 0.055 | 0.086 | 0.061 | 0.061 | 0.119 | 0.196 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.046 | 0.057 | 0.042 | 0.042 | 0.072 | 0.092 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

## Regressions Using 2014 - 2021 Data

We ran our regression models on the entire 2014 - 2021 dataset. We find no differences in our main findings above. Figure 3 depicts the simple regression of time frames on local land use approval steps. We found a positive association between number of approval steps and timeframes that is statistically significant. In this graph, the translucent bounds represent the confidence interval for the regression line. As was true in the regression of 2018 - 2021 data only, several observations fall outside the bounds of the confidence interval for the regression line. The confidence interval indicates the uncertainty in our regression estimates. This uncertainty suggests that there are other unaccounted variables that influence the existing relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

*Figure 8: Regression All Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2014 - 2021 (No Controls)*



Our results using the 2014 - 2021 dataset also show that when we control for affordability characteristics, project size, location within a vulnerable geographic area, and intensity of the approval process, there is no statistically significant association between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

We also add an additional model where we only exclude process controls. We find that there exists a positive, statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframes when we only control for affordability, project size, and area characteristics, but this relationship is numerically smaller and decreases in statistical significance when we add these controls.

*Table 19: Regression All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2014 - 2021 With Controls*

| Variables | No Controls | Affordability Controls | Neighborhood Controls | Size Controls | Process Controls | All Controls Except Process Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dependent Variable:** Timeframe (denoted in months) | | | | | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 3.328*** | 3.363*** | 3.149*** | 2.882*** | 2.998** | 2.643** | 2.263 |
| | (1.019) | (1.034) | (0.990) | (1.043) | (1.470) | (1.046) | (1.453) |
| Market-rate | | 14.441*** | | | | 13.854*** | 11.718** |
| | | (4.756) | | | | (5.168) | (5.446) |
| Mixed Income | | 12.003*** | | | | 11.610** | 10.510* |
| | | (4.539) | | | | (4.933) | (5.497) |
| Vulnerable Area | | | -3.878 | | | -3.577 | -3.798 |
| | | | (2.494) | | | (2.574) | (2.588) |
| Project Size | | | | 0.009 | | 0.012 | 0.016 |
| | | | | (0.010) | | (0.010) | (0.011) |
| Variance | | | | | 10.836* | | 10.407* |
| | | | | | (5.620) | | (5.763) |
| CUA & PUD | | | | | 4.266 | | 3.413 |
| | | | | | (3.793) | | (4.122) |
| Exceptions | | | | | 0.859 | | -0.183 |
| | | | | | (4.628) | | (5.428) |
| Legis. Acts | | | | | 5.815 | | 4.783 |
| | | | | | (8.056) | | (9.030) |
| Constant | 29.094*** | 16.346*** | 31.460*** | 28.968*** | 26.008*** | 18.847*** | 17.794*** |
| | (2.013) | (4.357) | (2.548) | (2.026) | (2.466) | (4.943) | (5.063) |
| Observations | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 |
| R-squared | 0.052 | 0.070 | 0.061 | 0.055 | 0.080 | 0.082 | 0.109 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.048 | 0.059 | 0.053 | 0.047 | 0.062 | 0.063 | 0.076 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

It is not typical for a development to have eight to nine steps to entitlement in San Francisco. Because it is possible that the relationship between approval steps and timeframes is driven by atypical projects in San Francisco (or observations that require eight or nine steps for approval), we also analyze the impact of outliers (in terms of the number of approval steps) on the relationship between approval steps and timeframes. Any observation in our discretionary, non-ADU dataset from 2018 - 2021 with more than four approval steps is considered an outlier.[108] We dropped these from our dataset and reran our regression models in the table below.

*Table 20: Regression Results, Dropping Approval Step Outliers (2014 - 2021 Data)*

| Variables | No Controls | Some Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dependent Variable: Timeframe (denoted by months) | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 1.987* | 1.685 | -0.756 |
| | (1.133) | (1.309) | (1.928) |
| Market-rate | | 17.294*** | 14.218*** |
| | | (3.723) | (3.982) |
| Mixed Income | | 15.522*** | 12.450*** |
| | | (3.397) | (4.428) |
| Vulnerable Area | | -1.829 | -2.090 |
| | | (2.666) | (2.683) |
| Project Size | | 0.006 | 0.010 |
| | | (0.012) | (0.013) |
| Variance | | | 13.440** |
| | | | (6.072) |
| CUA & PUD | | | 6.949 |
| | | | (4.802) |
| Exceptions | | | 7.935 |
| | | | (5.780) |
| Legs. Acts | | | 9.840 |
| | | | (7.396) |
| Constant | 30.585*** | 15.720*** | 15.110*** |
| | (2.205) | (3.880) | (4.142) |
| Observations | 229 | 229 | 229 |
| R-squared | 0.010 | 0.041 | 0.075 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.005 | 0.020 | 0.037 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses

[108] We calculated the bounds for large outliers (based on the number of approval steps) with the following formula: 1.5 * [75% Percentile – 25% Percentile] + 75% Percentile. For all 251 observations, the 25% percentile is one approval step and the 75th percentile is two approval steps. Using this formula, 1.5 * (2 – 1) + 2 = 3.5. Meaning, any observations with more than four approval steps are outliers.

We observe a positive association between approval steps and timeframes when we discard outlier observations, although this association is numerically smaller and decreases in statistical significance. When we exclude process controls in our regression—and only control for affordability, project size, and neighborhood characteristics—we find no statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframes. This suggests that the observations which required significantly more steps for approval play a role in the association between approval steps and timeframes. In other words, when we discard these observations to generate a dataset of more typical developments in San Francisco, we find no statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframe, controlling for factors outside of planning and zoning law. This also suggests that a more typical observation (an observation with two or three steps) would likely see no substantial difference in timeframe if it have been approved with fewer steps.

## Robustness Checks for Analysis

We generated correlation heat maps to understand existing associations between the independent variables in our models. If high correlations exist between our independent variables, it could lead to imperfect multicollinearity.

In the following correlation heat maps, the only variables that are highly associated with each other are indicator variables that are mutually exclusive and exhaustive. As a result of these heatmaps, we feel comfortable using these variables as independent variables in our regression.




*Figure 9: Correlation Heat Map for 2018 - 2021 Regression Data (N=111) with Affordability, Neighborhood, and Process Characteristics*

Residual Plots for Regressions

We also run residual plots for some of our models for assessment. First, we use the residual plots to assess our model's functional form (e.g., is the association between the number of approval steps and timeframes linear?). We also use residual plots to assess the effectiveness of our control variables. We are interested in understanding if the introduction of these control variables help capture the underlying associations within our data.

*Figure 10: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("No Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021*



*Figure 11: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("All Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021*




In Figure 10: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("No Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021, there is clustering in this plot. This indicates that the simple regression model is missing information to properly explain the relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes. It strongly indicates that there are factors outside the number of approval steps that impacts the linear relationship between timeframes.

Figure 11: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("All Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 shows the residual plot of the regression specification when we control for process intensity, project size, neighborhood vulnerability, whether the project received an administrative appeal, and affordability. The clustering in this residual plot is less pronounced, which indicates that the controls are effective

in capturing sources of variation that influence the relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes. Also, observe that there is no clear, consistent pattern in the residual plot. This indicates that a linear regression is most likely the best functional form for our model.

However, observe that the LOESS line is not a linear line at zero, but is rather slightly sloping downward. This indicates that there may be other omitted variables that impact the relationship between timeframes and approval steps, which may bias the magnitude of our regression estimates. Future regression work can test the use of interactive effects between independent variables or assess the impact of new control variables.

## Appendix B: Spatial Distribution of Developments

Affordability and TCAC Category Cross Sectional Table (N=144), 2018 - 2021[1]

| Highest Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 10 | 352 | - | 29.38 | 30.91 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 1 | 5 | - | 6.41 | 6.41 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 3 | 150 | 38 | 28.21 | 31.34 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 1[2] | 135 | 135 | 15.39 | 15.39 |
| **High Resource** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 9 | 328 | - | 39.81 | 38.15 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 6 | 47 | - | 9.63 | 17.20 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 6 | 242 | 43 | 53.51 | 53.48 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 2 | 19 | 19 | 9.53 | 9.53 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 2 | 228 | 228 | 4.47 | 4.47 |
| **Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing to higher resources)** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 4 | 47 | - | 32.74 | 37.44 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 1 | 7 | - | 21.99 | 21.99 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 3 | 237 | 81 | 32.08 | 28.48 |
| Mixed Inc.(ADU) | 1 | 24 | 3 | 41.19 | 41.19 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 2[3] | 268 | 267 | 26.20 | 26.20 |
| **Moderate Resource** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 18 | 1,555 | - | 40.41 | 40.30 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 6 | 38 | - | 26.50 | 24.38 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 21 | 2,564 | 520 | 41.03 | 40.67 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 1 | 178 | 176 | 28.04 | 28.04 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 2 | 175 | 173 | 4.65 | 4.65 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 1[4] | 63 | 63 | 41.39 | 41.39 |
| **Low Resource** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 14 | 1,982 | - | 38.45 | 47.15 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 19 | 1,153 | 191 | 27.58 | 33.47 |
| Mixed Inc.(Always SB 35) | 2 | 720 | 294 | 6.84 | 6.84 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 1 | 15 | 15 | 55.96 | 55.96 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 3 | 400 | 400 | 2.40 | 2.40 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 3[5] | 394 | 393 | 32.58 | 30.70 |

| High Segregation & Poverty | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 2 | 13 | - | 19.04 | 19.04 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |

[1] Observations that are student or group housing developments have been categorized as market-rate. We confirmed that group housing beds are not deed-restricted affordable.
[2] This is 1360 43rd Ave, originally proposed under 1351 42nd Ave. This project began as a discretionary entitlement. We use the earliest file date to calculate timeframes.
[3] The two SB 35 projects in this category of Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) began before SB 35 was signed into law, which influences timeframe calculations in this neighborhood classification. We logged one project, 2340 San Jose Ave, as having an earliest file date of 9/21/2017. We logged a second project, 4840 Mission St, as having an earliest file date of 9/21/2016. Further, 2340 San Jose Ave does not have an eligibility determination date, though we know it received a building permit. But we excluded it from timeframe analysis.
[4] This is 2205 Mission St, which began as a discretionary project.
[5] Three SB 35 projects in this category (Low Resource) began before SB 35 was signed into law.

## Affordability and 2021 TCAC Category Cross Sectional Table, 2014 - 2017

| Highest Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 3 | 69 | - | 89.98 | 79.68 |
| Mixed Income | 1 | 41 | 6 | 38.70 | 38.70 |
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| High Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 6 | 120 | - | 23.79 | 24.77 |
| Mixed Income | 5 | 287 | 27 | 18.94 | 20.92 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 4 | 100 | - | 19.50 | 21.48 |
| Mixed Income | 3 | 527 | 171 | 34.26 | 32.10 |
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Moderate Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 29 | 2415 | - | 26.37 | 34.31 |
| Mixed Income | 25 | 3071 | 415 | 31.59 | 35.11 |
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Low Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 20 | 1600 | - | 23.98 | 27.17 |
| Mixed Income | 39 | 5472 | 982 | 31.23 | 30.30 |
| 100% Affordable | 4 | 400 | 400 | 13.73 | 14.16 |
| High Segregation & Poverty | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| Mixed Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 100% Affordable | 1 | 167 | 167 | 34.49 | 34.49 |

Affordability and Priority Equity Geographies (PEG) Sectional Table, 2018 - 2021 (N=144)

| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by PEG | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate(Discretionary) | 26 | 2,377 | - | 36.85 | 43.54 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 6 | 37 | - | 21.70 | 22.56 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 35 | 2,424 | 468 | 32.09 | 34.97 |
| Mixed Inc.(Always SB 35) | 1 | 270 | 109 | 6.05 | 6.05 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 1 | 24 | 3 | 41.19 | 41.19 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 1 | 15 | 15 | 55.96 | 55.96 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 4[2] | 512 | 510 | 2.91 | 3.31 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began As Disc.) | 6 | 725 | 723 | 32.58 | 31.94 |
| **Not In a Vulnerable Area, Denoted by PEG** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 29 | 1,88773 | - | 36.00 | 36.40 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 10 | | - | 9.71 | 18.07 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 17 | 1,922 | 405 | 42.44 | 45.09 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 1 | 450 | 185 | 7.63 | 7.63 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 3 | 197 | 195 | 11.31 | 15.70 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 3 | 291 | 291 | 2.76 | 3.90 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began As Disc.) | 1 | 135 | 135 | 15.39 | 15.30 |

**Distribution of Affordable Units (Inclusive of 11 Observations From Updated APR)**

2014 - 2015 Affordable Units, by 2021 TCAC Distribution (N=351 new affordable units)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | 0 | 0.00% |
| High Resource | 3 | 3.70% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | 0 | 0.00% |
| Moderate Resource | 194 | 55 .27% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Low Resource | 144 | 41.03% |
| High Segregation and Poverty | 0 | 0.00% |

2016 - 2017 Affordable Units Distribution, by 2021 TCAC (N=1,817 new affordable units)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | 6 | 0.33% |
| High Resource | 14 | 0.77% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | 171 | 9.41% |
| Moderate Resource | 221 | 12.16% |
| Low Resource | 1,238 | 68.13% |
| High Segregation and Poverty | 167 | 9.19% |

2018 - 2019 Affordable Units Distribution by 2021 TCAC, Expanded by SB 35 Affordable Units (N=1,390 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=896)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | Total: 22<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 22 | Total: 1.58% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| High Resource | Total: 17<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 17 | Total: 1.22% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | Total: 336<br>● SB 35: 267<br>● Non SB 35: 69 | Total: 24.17% |
| Moderate Resource | Total: 321<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 321 | Total: 23.09% |
| Low Resource | Total: 694<br>● SB 35: 629<br>● Non SB 35: 65 | Total: 49.93% |
| High Segregation and Poverty | Total: 0<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 0 | Total: 0.00% |

2020 - 2021 Affordable Units Distribution by 2021 TCAC, Expanded by SB 35 Affordable Units (N=1,649 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=1,057)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | Total: 151<br>● SB 35: 135<br>● Non SB 35: 16 | Total: 9.16% |
| High Resource | Total: 273<br>● SB 35: 228<br>● Non SB 35: 45 | Total: 16.56% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | Total: 15<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 15 | Total: 0.91% |
| Moderate Resource | Total: 611<br>● SB 35: 236<br>● Non SB 35: 375 | Total: 37.05% |
| Low Resource | Total: 599<br>● SB 35: 458<br>● Non SB 35: 141 | Total: 36.33% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| High Segregation and Poverty | Total: 0<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 0 | Total: 0.00% |

**Distribution of Affordable Units, by Priority Equity Geographies**

2014 - 2015 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=351 new affordable units)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 154 | 43.87% |
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 197 | 56.13% |

2016 - 2017 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,817 new affordable units)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 282 | 15.52% |
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 1,535 | 84.48% |

2018 - 2019 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,390 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=896)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 294<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non-SB 35: 294 | Total: 21.15% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 1,096<br>• SB 35: 896<br>• Non-SB 35: 200 | Total: 78.85% |

2020 - 2021 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,649 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=1,057)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 732<br>• SB 35: 446<br>• Non-SB 35: 286 | Total: 44.39% |
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 917<br>• SB 35: 611<br>• Non-SB 35: 306 | Total: 55.61% |

Number and Percentage of 100% Affordable Developments in Areas with a Higher Density of Vulnerable Populations, by Year.

| Year | Number of 100% Affordable Entitlements | Percentage of 100% Affordable Entitlements in Sensitive Geographies |
|---|---|---|
| 2014 – 2017 (N=5) | Total: 5 | Total: 100% |
| 2018 – 2019 (N=8) | Total: 6<br>• SB 35: 6<br>• Discretionary Non-ADU: 0 | Total: 75% |
| 2020 – 2021 (N=10) | Total: 5<br>• SB 35: 4<br>• Discretionary Non-ADU: 1 | Total: 50% |

**Appendix C: Analysis of Accuracy of Annual Progress Report Data on Entitlements and SB 35 Approvals**

We relied on Annual Progress Report data that we pulled over three periods. For the 2018 - 2019 analysis, we first built a list of observations from 2018 - 2019 APR data that we gained access to on May 18, 2020. We began collecting data on these observations for related research during the 2021 - 2022 academic year, prior to working with HCD on this study. We did not collect as much information as we did for this research during that period, however. We then downloaded San Francisco's Original 2020 - 2021 APR data on or around October 2, 2022, to construct our original observation list for data collection. We then downloaded 2021 APR data on February 18, 2023. Then we downloaded all four years—2018 - 2021—APR data on July 14, 2023, from the state data dashboard to do a final check to confirm if we had any additional observations that may have come in through corrected reporting for any one of these four years. We also separately reviewed environmental review determinations to identify any possible observations not included in any APR data.

San Francisco reported 72 entitlements or SB 35 approvals in 2018 and 2019 on the report we accessed dated May 18, 2020.

- Of the 72 entitlements or SB 35 approvals from 2018 - 2019, we determined that 45 of these observations (~63%) were entitled in 2018 - 2019 and reported in the correct year.
- Therefore, 27 entitlements or SB 35 approvals (~38%) in the 2018 - 2019 APR (N=72) were incorrect reports.
- We found an additional seven entitlements or SB 35 approvals issued in 2018 - 2019 that San Francisco reported in another year (or the wrong year).
- The 2018 - 2019 APR Report also missed 33 entitlements issued in those years, which we found from reviewing San Francisco's Environmental Review Documents and Planning Commission Agendas.

San Francisco reported 82 observations entitled in 2020. San Francisco reported 30 entitlements or SB 35 approvals in 2021. Combined, San Francisco reported 112 entitlements or SB 35 approvals across 2020 - 2021.

- Of the 112 observations from 2020 - 2021, we determined that 45 of these observations (~40%) were entitled in 2020 - 2021 and San Francisco reported the correct year.
- We found an additional 18 entitlements or SB 35 approvals issued in 2020 - 2021 that San Francisco reported, but reported as entitled in the wrong year.
- 67 observations (~60%) in the 2020 - 2021 APR (N=112) are incorrect reports.
- Most, or 62 (out of 67), incorrect reports in the 2020 - 2021 APR are from Reporting Year 2020.
- The 2020 - 2021 APR data also missed an additional 21 entitlements, which we found through reviewing environmental review determinations.

In the inaccurate reporting across 2018 - 2021, we determined six entitlements that San Francisco incorrectly reported in 2018 - 2021 were entitled sometime in 2014 - 2017.

We also used the July 14, 2023, download of San Francisco's Annual Progress Reports to HCD a final time to run a second audit of the 2018 - 2021 APR before completing all analysis. In total, San Francisco underreported on 69 entitlements or SB 35 approvals across those four years.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Howard |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; rachel.tanner@sfgov.org; Chen, Lisa (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary |
| **Subject:** | UPZONING: ANALYSIS: PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 6:02:46 AM |
| **Attachments:** | ~~~~PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING 12-25.pdf |

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

FOR HEARINGS ON UPZONING PLAN
**TO:** Board of Supervisors
**CC:** Mayor Lurie/ Office, Planning Commission/ Staff
**ATTACHED: PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING**

An entertaining and informative analysis of the history of Waterfront Land-Use Battles, development fights, upzoning, housing options, affordable housing around the world and photos.
Best Regards, Howard Wong, AIA
**P.S.: Please include in Board Package---online and printed (if possible) for public education.**

# PERFECT PLANNING = ICONIC BEAUTY + HOUSING

## OPPOSE WATERFRONT UPZONING *Please share this!*

**SEE BELOW: HISTORY OF SF WATERFRONT LAND-USE BATTLES:**

PROTECT WATERFRONT BEAUTY AND HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOODS AS ECONOMIC ASSETS
San Francisco's waterfront/ hilltop beauty is priceless. Environmental capital, like physical/ visual links to the Bay, has quantifiable value. The City's Mediterranean beauty differentiates it from most cities. Tourism attracts 23 million visitors and $9 billion/ year. Public vistas fuel a real estate industry of up to $10 billion/ year. Conservatively, waterfront beauty has a $2 billion valuation/ year---for perpetuity.

**History makes the case for Voter Approval of waterfront development/ height increases**
Generations of San Franciscans have fought to protect the beauty and scale of the northern waterfront. Upzoning at the northern waterfront would override General Plans, urban design/ environmental elements, planning priorities, design guidelines, settled law, ballot measures, legislation, codes, and voter advocacy for a Mediterranean scale---with building heights tapering gently upward to hilltops.

**Planning codes have reinforced the waterfront's 40-foot height limit** as a benchmark for tapering heights---protecting visual corridors to the bay. Public and legal directives have elevated environmental beauty as a priority, aspiring to the beauty of Venice, Florence, Santorini, Paris and great places that have protected their timeless treasures and World Heritage Sites---actual and potential.

## HOUSING: SUPERLATIVE OPTIONS *Please share this!*

INSTEAD OF PLANNERS, HIRE MATHEMATICIANS AND FINANCIERS TO CREATE NEW HOUSING.
San Francisco's Chief Economist deems the SF Upzoning Plan as unrealistic. ***Why approve a deleterious upzoning plan, harming neighborhoods and waterfronts, when better options exist?*** Throughout the world, cities/ countries/ people have built vast amounts of affordable housing for their growing populations. Besides, San Francisco has already built, entitled more projects, and forecasts more development than almost any city in the region and state.

**Mathematicians can finetune hypotheses and calculate housing construction accurately.**
Depending on the timeline, completed projects, in-progress projects, entitled projects, proposed projects (more every day), untapped zoning capacity, infill development, availability of public land, new financing plans, new area/ neighborhood plans, and revised incentives/ housing types/ unit sizes/ densification, San Francisco can likely meet its RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation)---without flailing citywide upzoning. Rather than number of housing units, the focus should be on the number of people housed.

**Financiers can coalesce all funding to effectively build housing:** $20 billion MTC Regional Affordable Housing Bond (2028 as a revolving fund), local/ state housing bonds, grants, trust funds, tax credits, tax increment financing, low-interest loans, public banks, nonprofits, philanthropy, partnerships, rent subsidies, and more. Many countries have affordable housing strategies and programs---worth emulating. ***Affordable housing is not for lack of zoning, but lack of comprehensive planning.***

**DO THE MATH: HOUSING TAKES MANY FORMS:** After the 1906 Earthquake, 250,000 San Franciscans were homeless (60% of the population)---quickly housed in tens/t camps and tiny redwood cottages. Today, the homeless instinctively gather in encampments, RV/ car clusters, for community and self-support. As seen throughout the world, affordable housing can take the form of cooperative housing, micro-housing, shared housing, land trusts, accessory units, modular dwellings, single-room occupancies, boarding houses, public housing, dual-use spaces, and informal communities (at least for the near/ short term). Rio de Janeiro's favelas are naturally-occurring low-income squatter housing---a normal human response to homelessness. 35% of Lima's population live in squatter settlements and 50% are employed in informal jobs. Around the world, 1 billion people live in slums or other informal settlements.

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS A PUBLIC POLICY CHOICE.** Government has economic tools to invest in land, utilize public property, zone for public benefits, provide public services, incentivize smaller/ plentiful dwellings, provide flexibility in housing, give tax incentives, prioritize approvals and permitting. Not inconceivable, like China and forty other countries, government can build new cities and towns---on public land. China has built hundreds of new cities, including many with one million residents. ***The region and the state can carry its housing fair share, not just the 49 square miles of San Francisco.***

**RENTCHAMBER: The Top 10 Countries with Exceptional Housing Policies**
**https://rentchamber.com/the-top-10-countries-with-exceptional-housing-policies/**
**WIKIPEDIA: Affordable Housing by Country:**
**https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Affordable_housing_by_country**

**GUARDIAN: The social housing secret: how Vienna became the world's most livable city**
**https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2024/jan/10/the-social-housing-secret-how-vienna-became-the-worlds-most-livable-city**
**NPR: Could this city be the model for how to tackle the housing crisis and climate change?**
**https://www.npr.org/2025/06/15/nx-s1-5400642/affordable-housing-environment-vienna-climate-change**
**HOUSING PERSPECTIVES: What Can We Learn from the Dutch Social Housing System?**
**https://www.jchs.harvard.edu/blog/what-can-we-learn-dutch-social-housing-system**
**ASSEMBLE PAPERS: A primer on social housing in Amsterdam**
**https://assemblepapers.com.au/2018/12/13/amsterdam-social-housing-a-primer/**
**ROUTE FIFTY: Hungry for affordable housing, communities turn to land trusts** **https://www.route-fifty.com/management/2024/09/hungry-affordable-housing-communities-turn-land-trusts/399784/?oref=rf-today-nl&utm_source=Sailthru&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Route%20Fifty%20Today:%20September%2025%2C%202024&utm_term=newsletter_rf_today**
**BLOOMBERG: Why Singapore Has One of the Highest Home Ownership Rates**
**https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-07-08/behind-the-design-of-singapore-s-low-cost-housing?cmpid=BBD102120_CITYLAB&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&utm_term=201021&utm_campaign=citylabdaily**

**WATERFRONT BEAUTY = BEST ECONOMICS** ***Please share this!***

# HISTORY: SF WATERFRONT LAND-USE BATTLES

**Over time, by tapering heights downward towards the waterfront, public vistas and San Francisco's hills/ beauty will be preserved for all---an economic asset that attracts 23 million visitors and $9 billion per year.**

**SAN FRANCISCO HAS THWARTED DARWINIAN MARKET FORCES**, which threaten prime waterfront sites for obstructive development. Big money is spent to push projects by the few who benefit financially---developers, contractors, consultants, public relations firms, city staff, politicians, and groups that reap donations, fees, payments, and wages. Instead, citizens/ height limits/ codes have protected our Mediterranean village-like character for all.

**SAN FRANCISCO'S WATERFRONT BATTLES** led to protective tapering height limits, which preserve public vistas and a Mediterranean village-like beauty for everyone. Powerful special interests attempt to override codes---to gain extraordinary favors. Each code exemption is used to justify subsequent height increases----a never-ending ratcheting upward. Learning from history, we can better appreciate the waterfront's esthetic and economic value.

The Fontana Towers led to the 40-foot height limit on the waterfront.

The Fontana Towers battle stopped five other high-rises at Aquatic Park.

San Francisco's Freeway Revolt started a national movement.

The Embarcadero Freeway was stopped at Broadway---in mid-construction.

The Embarcadero Freeways demolition opened the waterfront.

Freeway plans wrapped around the entire waterfront and throughout the city.

WPA Freeway Plan, around northern waterfront---and over Columbus Ave.



The freeway wall along the waterfront was a near reality.




"Save The Bay" map and Reber Plan for bay infill.

Citizen activists and founders of "Save The Bay": Esther Gulick, Sylvia McLaughlin, Catherine Kerr.

**HISTORY TEACHES US** that many design options exist for any site---like fully code-compliant alternatives or open space. After contentious debates, better designs often result.
FOUNDSF: The Fontana Towers and Waterfront Battle.
**http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=Height_Limit_Revolt_Saves_Waterfront_Vistas**
Residents of Russian Hill and Attorney Casper Weinberger (a Republican conservationist) stopped towers along the waterfront. A coalition fought for the waterfront 40-foot height limits. Later, height limits on Russian Hill were passed.

Bridge and large development proposed adjacent to Telegraph Hill---through North Beach.

Bridge and freeways proposed atop Telegraph Hill.



The Rush Bridge from Telegraph Hill had three stories of traffic lanes.



Proposed bridge from Telegraph Hill to Angel Island & Tiburon---stopped by Washington officials.

Russian Hill: Ten years after 40-foot height limit.



Ferry Building Project (1968) with helipad atop roof.

World Trade Center (1950) demolishes Ferry Building.

World Trade Center's terraced high-rises at waterfront.

Proposed 30-story skyscraper at waterfront.



U.S. Steel Building Complex---South of Ferry Building.

Embarcadero Crescent (1961): Ferry Building to Aquatic Park.

Embarcadero Crescent (1961): Bay development east of Telegraph Hill.

The 1963 Downtown Plan had two high-rises flanking the saved Ferry Building's tower.

Old Produce Market's tenants fought and were displaced by the Golden Gateway towers.

Instead of more Golden Gateway towers, activists fought for the low-rise Golden Gateway Commons.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL**: A long-term economic measure includes incorporating "natural capital"---the value of such things as esthetics, nature, and generic diversity---into economic decision-making. From a long-range perspective, waterfront beauty has incalculable economic value---for regional drawing power and people's happiness quotient.

Russian Hill Towers (1958): Mies van der Rohe proposal with block-long parking garage.



Port Authority Plan (1959: Office buildings, hotel, commercial, terminal….

International Market Place (1968): Multiblock complex at foot of Telegraph Hill.

Ferry Building Plans (1968): Northern Waterfront Plan.



Port Plaza Project (1970)" Ferry Building and Pier 1.

Villamarina Project (1974): The piers and area around Aquatic Park developed.

Pei-Cobb-Fried Proposal (1980)" Office and commercial at Ferry Building and Pier 1.

Koll's Sailing Center (1980)" Piers at Bay Bridge---Hotel, restaurant, retail, marina….

SWL 330 Condo Tower (2006) built though Pier 30-32 cruise terminal cancelled.

Arena/ Condo Project (2014): Entertainment venue and condo towers around Pier 30-32---moved.

**THE DEVELOPER-POLITICAL COMPLEX** of financial interests works to heighten development, to escalate land values and to transfer public assets to private interests. Freeways and subways are regional escalators of real estate values by promoting well-heeled commuters. The Developer-Political Complex is a network of financial self-interests --- developers, realtors, contractors, consultants, public relations firms, politicians, city staff, nonprofits, and groups who receive donations, fees, payments, and wages. Citizens have rightfully fought for their assets.

> FOUNDSF: "The Freeway Revolt" **http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=The_Freeway_Revolt**
> **O**n November 2, 1956 the *San Francisco Chronicle* graciously published a map of the proposed and actual freeway routes through San Francisco even though its accompanying editorial was already chastising protestors: "The remarkable aspect of these protests and claims of injury is their tardiness. They concern projects that have for years been set forth in master plans, surveys, and expensive traffic studies. They have been ignored or overlooked by citizens and public official alike—until the time was at hand for concrete pouring and when revision had become either impossible or extremely costly. The evidence indicates that the citizenry never did know or had forgotten what freeways the planners had in mind for them."

**WE ARE ON LIFE'S STAGE EVER SO BRIEFLY** relative to the timeless beauty of the waterfront environment. It is the responsibility of each generation to protect natural assets for all.

## Howard Wong, AIA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 25, 2025 9:13:04 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** mark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Hanlon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, November 26, 2025 9:45:25 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long-time San Franciscan whose family has lived her for generations, both as renters and home-owners, I care deeply about the character and livability of our neighborhoods. I write to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's current upzoning proposal. As written, the plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and risks turning diverse residential areas into corridors of luxury high-rises that most San Franciscans cannot afford.

I'm asking you to:

Substantially scale back the Mayor's proposed upzoning maps

Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

These maps would create permanent and irreversible land-use changes across the city, far beyond what state or regional requirements demand — and with no meaningful affordability commitments. In practice, they clear a path for widespread demolition and large luxury developments that largely serve investors rather than the communities they reshape.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning that protects existing residents, supports small businesses, and ensures genuine affordability — not displacement packaged as progress.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.

Sincerely,
Mark Hanlon
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** Justin Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Thursday, November 27, 2025 11:23:55 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jen Reck |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Land Use and Transportation meeting December 1st |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 11:52:15 AM |

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee Members:

I am writing regarding an agenda item on your meeting today regarding the Mayor's upzoning plan. I am an Executive Co-Chair of the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District Advisory Board and an associate professor of Sociology at San Francisco State University with an expertise in queer urban development, homelessness, and the built environment.

I strongly support amendments to the plan that will protect rent controlled units from being destroyed as part of the development allowed by the upzoning plan. While streamlining development and the building permit processes will help San Francisco comply with the requirements of the state housing element, it is vital that we pursue these actions with equity in mind and ensure that existing residents can stay in place even as we seek to build more units of housing.

Protecting rent controlled units is a vital part of San Francisco's culture and commitment to access and equity. Please vote to strengthen rent control protections and disallow demolition of any rent control buildings., as well as removing all rent control units from the local bonus.

Rent control units are a housing protection in San Francisco that have probably done the most to counter gentrification and prevent displacement of San Francisco renters. I respectfully request that you help preserve the cultural heritage of San Francisco by protecting those who live here, particularly because many of them are only able to remain living here due to their access to rent controlled housing.

Thank you,

Jen Reck

--
Jen Reck, PhD
Executive Co-Chair
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
San Francisco, California

*pronouns: she / they*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | D M LaPointe |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Submission of WTPCC Letter to the Land Use & Transportation Committee |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 11:20:45 AM |
| **Attachments:** | WTPCC-LU-upzoning - 12-1-25.docx |

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

Dear Chair and Clerk,

Please find attached the West of Twin Peaks Central Council's letter regarding the Family Zoning Plan for consideration by the Land Use & Transportation Committee. We respectfully request that this letter be entered into the official record for the upcoming hearing.

Thank you for your attention.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

# West of Twin Peaks Central Council

*A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936*

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/


December 1, 2025

Chair and Members of the Land Use & Transportation Committee:

On behalf of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council and the thousands of homeowners and families we represent, we register our firm and unequivocal opposition to the Family Zoning Plan unless it is substantially amended.

We believe in housing. We believe in growth. And we have proved it - approving and welcoming thousands of new homes at Stonestown, Parkmerced, Balboa Reservoir, and throughout our corridors. Our neighborhoods have done our part and remain ready to do more.

But this proposal is not real planning. It is paper compliance masquerading as progress, shifting the costs and destabilizing impacts onto the very neighborhoods that have kept San Francisco livable, stable, and resilient.

The City's own financial analysis makes one fact unavoidable: only mid-rise redevelopment pencils out. That means this plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes - not on transit corridors already upzoned by SB 79, but deep inside long-standing, middle-class neighborhoods. SB 79 is already the law. Local zoning will be overridden in 2032. The City should be defending its residents - homeowners and long-term residents alike - not eliminating their remaining protections through density decontrol.

Density decontrol must be removed. Without that amendment, the plan reads as a teardown blueprint, not a family housing strategy.

A central flaw in the proposal is the assumption that so-called "well-resourced neighborhoods" should absorb the city's unmet housing goals, even though these areas do not have the infrastructure capacity to support significant added density. This approach contradicts the City's own service and transit data. Effective equity planning pairs new housing with targeted investment in under-served communities - expanding transit, upgrading utilities, and improving public services where it will meaningfully reduce disparities. Concentrating demolition incentives in stable neighborhoods while leaving actual inequities unaddressed is not sound planning and does not advance the City's stated equity goals.

WTPCC therefore urges the Committee to adopt these essential changes:

**Eliminate density decontrol.**
It is unnecessary, inequitable, and guaranteed to trigger speculative demolition pressure.

**Protect small businesses and merchant corridors.**
West Portal, Taraval, and Lakeside cannot absorb displacement without losing the local merchants who define them.

**Restore design review, public notice, and protection of historic resources.**
Residents - especially longtime homeowners - have the right to transparency. Eliminating due process is unjustifiable.

**Guarantee strong protections for existing homeowners and long-term residents.**
Middle-class families, whether they rent or own, are the backbone of San Francisco and deserve respect, stability, and a meaningful voice.

At the same time, WTPCC and its members are committed partners in real solutions -and we are sounding this alarm now because the unintended consequences of this plan will be profound and irreversible if the City does not course-correct. We stand ready to help the City unlock and incentivize the more than 70,000 approved units already in the pipeline - homes that can be delivered now, without destabilizing established neighborhoods or erasing neighborhood identity.

Our stable, historic, family-oriented neighborhoods are not obstacles - they are the civic bedrock and democratic center of gravity of this city, composed of taxpayers who keep San Francisco running. To ignore this constituency and insist that one community upend its way of life to cover for years of government failure is not equity - it is a fundamental injustice. No credible planning effort punishes families and homeowners for problems created by City Hall.

If the City is serious about housing, it will focus on the 70,000 units already approved - not dismantle the neighborhoods that sustain the city.

Amend this plan. Protect homeowners and tenants, small business and historic resources. And prove that San Francisco can grow without sacrificing the very neighborhoods that make it worth fighting for.

Sincerely,

Denise LaPointe
President | WTPCC

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors and Members
WTPCC Delegates

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Tina Aguirre |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Cc:** | Sucre, Richard (CPC); Jen Reck; Wyatt Robertson; Joshua Ochoa; Michael Karavolias; Shayne Watson; M Rocket; Alexandre Fellous; Andrew Gutierrez III |
| **Subject:** | Protect rent control units from getting demolished by developers |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 10:39:38 AM |

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee Members:

As the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District Director, I respectfully ask that you help protect rent control units in San Francisco. The Castro LGBTQ Cultural District supports amendments to the Mayor's Upzoning Plan to protect rent control units from getting demolished by developers. Protections should be strengthened to disallow demolition of any rent control buildings. We also support removing all rent control units from the local bonus.

Rent control units have helped counter gentrification and displacement of LGBTQ+ community members since its inception in 1979. Please help preserve the cultural heritage of San Francisco by protecting its most important element: the people who live and thrive here.

Thank you,

Tina Aguirre

copy: Rich Sucre, Planning
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District Advisory Board Members

----------
Mx. Tina V. Aguirre
Cultural District Director
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
pronouns: they/them/theirs

**From:** Eileen Hirst
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, December 1, 2025 10:07:21 AM

---

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

As the Land Use and Transportation Committee again considers Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, I urge you to listen to the Planning staff, the City Economist and the hundreds of San Franciscans who are telling you that this plan will not result in the workforce housing needed to encourage families to stay in San Francisco, nor will it meet the state's artificial housing requirement.

I urge you to reject this plan and direct the Planning Department to identify parcels ripe for affordable, family-appropriate housing now, and I urge you to direct the appropriate city agencies to work with housing developers to finance that housing and streamline the permitting process to make it happen now, because now is when we need it.

If you insist on passing this misbegotten scheme, I urge you to adopt the common sense amendments offered by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.

I urge you to retain the 40-foot height limit on more than 30 alleys, some as narrow as 11 feet wide, on Russian Hill.

I urge you to retain the 40-foot height limit on the blocks bounded by Hyde, Vallejo, Filbert and Larkin Streets.

You cannot have the Family Zoning Plan both ways. If, in fact, Planning staff and the City Economist are correct that this plan will not produce the required housing, there is no reason to pass it to the full Board. If, as some maintain, the plan will result in tens of thousands of housing units, passing it without provisions for necessary accompanying infrastructure and requirements for affordable, family-appropriate housing is reckless and irresponsible.

You have one chance to get this right. Have the courage to send it back to the drawing board and not allow San Francisco to be bullied by the state. Have the courage to stand up for San Francisco and demand a plan that will really work.

Thank you,

Eileen Hirst
Resident of Russian Hill

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | James Lloyd |
| **To:** | Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney |
| **Subject:** | public comment re Family Zoning plan for today"s Land Use Committee meeting |
| **Date:** | Monday, December 1, 2025 9:16:53 AM |
| **Attachments:** | CFH v BH - 2023-12-21 - Judgment.pdf<br>San Francisco - Family Zoning Plan - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.12.01.pdf<br>ucb-examining-local-law-policy-planning-practice-on-development-in-sf-using-cales.pdf |

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund and Californians for Homeownership submit the attached public comment (and referenced attachments) for today's Land Use Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning Plan, agendized as items 2 through 9.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Electronically Received 10/27/2023 11:58 PM

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
12/21/2023
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: M. Mort Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

| | |
|---|---|
| CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation,<br><br>Petitioner,<br><br>v.<br><br>CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS,<br><br>Respondent. | Case No. 23STCP00143<br><br>**[~~PROPOSED~~] JUDGMENT**<br><br>Assigned for all purposes to:<br>Hon. Curtis A. Kin (Dept. 82) |

On September 12, 2023, the Court held a hearing on Petitioner's Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate. After considering the parties' papers and oral argument, the Court issued the decision attached hereto as Exhibit A.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED**:

1. Judgment is entered in favor of Petitioner on the Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate.

2. A writ of mandate shall issue pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 and Government Code section 65754 (a) requiring Respondent to bring the housing element of its general plan into substantial compliance with state law within 120 days of the date of this judgment, (b) requiring Respondent to bring its zoning ordinance into consistency with the housing element of its general plan within 120 days of the amendment required by (a), and (c) requiring Respondent to

file a return to the writ within 250 days of the date of this judgment.

3. Pursuant to subdivision (a)(1) of Government Code section 65755, the Court hereby suspends the authority of Respondent to issue building permits pursuant to Division 13 (commencing with section 17910) of the Health and Safety Code, and all other related permits, except for permits that create new residential bedrooms or units, and except for permits subject to subdivision (b) of Government Code section 65755, until the City has substantially complied with the requirements of Article 5 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code (commencing with Government Code Section 65300).

4. The Court hereby declares that Respondent City of Beverly Hills has not adopted a substantially compliant general plan housing element

5. Petitioner is entitled to recover its reasonable and legally-authorized costs pursuant to a memorandum of costs to be subsequently filed with the Court.

Dated: 12/21/2023

Curtis A. Kin/Judge

Hon. Curtis A. Kin
Judge of the Superior Court

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of October, 2023
CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.

Matthew P. Gelfand

Attorneys for Petitioner CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.

# EXHIBIT A

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
SEP 12 2023
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By: M. Mort, Deputy

**Superior Court of California**
**County of Los Angeles**

| | |
|---|---|
| CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC.,<br><br>Petitioner,<br><br>vs.<br><br>CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS,<br><br>Respondent. | Case No. 23STCP00143<br><br>**RULING ON VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE**<br><br>Dept. 82 (Hon. Curtis A. Kin) |

Petitioner Californians for Homeownership, Inc. petitions for a writ of mandate directing respondent City of Beverly Hills to adopt a revised housing element pursuant to Government Code § 65754.

## I. Factual Background

The State of California requires each city to have a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development" of the city. (Gov. Code § 65300.)[1] Each general plan must have a housing element. (§ 65302(c).) The housing element consists of 'standards and plans for housing sites in the municipality that 'shall endeavor to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community.' [Citations.]" (*California Building Industry Assn. v. City of San Jose* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 435, 444; *see also* § 65580 [legislative findings concerning housing element law].)

"A municipality must review its housing element for the appropriateness of its housing goals, objectives, and policies and must revise the housing element in accordance with a statutory schedule." (*Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193, 222, citing § 65588(a), (b).) "The interval between the due dates for

[1] All statutory references are to the Government Code, unless otherwise specified.

the revised housing element is referred to as a planning period or cycle, which usually is eight years." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 222, citing § 65588(e)(3), (f)(1).)

"A revised housing element's assessment of needs must quantify the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels, which includes the locality's proportionate share of regional housing needs for each income level." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing § 65583(a)(1).) "The projected regional housing needs for a planning period are determined by the HCD [Department of Housing and Community Development] in consultation with regional 'councils of government.'" (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing §§ 65584(a) & (b), 65584.01, 65588(e)(3).) "Based on the HCD's regional housing needs determination, each regional council of governments adopts a 'final regional housing need plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need' among the cities and counties within its region." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 223, citing § 65584(b).)

For the 2021-2029 planning period, the City Council of respondent City of Beverly Hills ("City") adopted a housing element on October 12, 2021 and submitted it for review to HCD. (JR 776.) On January 14, 2022, HCD determined that the housing element did not fully comply with the housing element law and provided necessary revisions. (JR 1309-16.)

On September 28, 2022, the City submitted a revised housing element to HCD. (JR 776.) On November 28, 2022, HCD determined that the revised housing element did not fully comply with the housing element law and provided necessary revisions. (JR 1318-24.)

On February 21, 2023, after having revised the September 2022 housing element, the City adopted the revision. (JR 5.) On February 21, 2023, petitioner Californians for Homeownership, Inc., who monitors local compliance with the housing element law, sent a letter to the City asserting that the revised housing element was inadequate for reasons identified by HCD and petitioner. (JR 1584-85.) On May 12, 2023, HCD determined that the housing element does not substantially comply with housing element law. (RJN Ex. B.)

## II. Procedural History

On January 18, 2023, petitioner filed a verified petition for writ of mandate. On May 24, 2023, pursuant to stipulation, petitioner filed a verified first amended petitioner for writ of mandate.

On June 22, 2023, during the trial setting conference, the Court set the hearing on the instant petition for September 12, 2023.

On July 14, 2023, petitioner filed an opening brief. On August 15, 2023, respondent filed an opposition. On August 31, 2023, petitioner filed a reply.

## III. Request for Judicial Notice

Petitioner's requests for judicial notice are ruled on as follows:

- Exhibit A (September 15, 2017 Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1397 (2017-2018 Session)) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c); *Wood v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals* (2023) 88 Cal.App.5th 742, 751, fn. 4)

- Exhibit B (May 12, 2023 Letter from HCD to City) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

- Exhibit C (Staff Report for June 22, 2023 Meeting of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit D (Minutes of June 22, 2023 Meeting of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit E (Resolution No. 1907 of Beverly Hills Planning Commission) – DENIED

- Exhibit F (2022 Form 10-K for Creative Media & Community Trust Corporation (Excerpts)) – DENIED

- Exhibit G (June 10, 2020 Memorandum of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, Entitled "Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook") – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

- Exhibit H (City of Gardena's 2021-2029 Housing Element, Table C-1) – GRANTED (Evid. Code § 452(c))

With respect to denying the request for judicial notice of Exhibits C, D, E, and F, the Court notes these exhibits are extra-record evidence petitioner presents to demonstrate that certain sites listed in the sites inventory of the housing element are improperly included. For the reason stated in section V.C below, this is improper. The exhibits are accordingly irrelevant. (*Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1057, 1063 ["Although a court may judicially notice a variety of matters (Evid. Code, § 450 *et seq.*), only relevant material may be noticed"].)

## IV. Standard of Review

CCP § 1085(a) provides: "A writ of mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station, or to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to

which the party is entitled, and from which the party is unlawfully precluded by that inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person."

"Any action brought by any interested party to review the conformity with the provisions of this article of any housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto shall be brought pursuant to Section 1085 of the Code of Civil Procedure; the court's review of compliance with the provisions of this article shall extend to whether the housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto substantially complies with the requirements of this article." (§ 65587(b); *see also* § 65751.) Substantial compliance means "actual compliance in respect to the substance essential to every reasonable objective of the statute, as distinguished from mere technical imperfections of form." (*Martinez,* 90 Cal.App.5th at 237, internal citations omitted.)

"[A] city's adoption of a housing element is a legislative enactment, something which is generally entitled to some deference." (*Fonseca v. City of Gilroy* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1174, 1191.) "If the municipality has substantially complied with statutory requirements, we will not interfere with its legislative action, unless that action was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support." (*Ibid.*) The challenging party has the burden to demonstrate that the housing element is inadequate. (*Ibid.*)

## V. Analysis

### A. This Dispute is Not Moot

As a preliminary matter, respondent asserts that the City anticipates adopting a revised housing element in November of this year to address concerns about the current housing element. (Wiener Decl. ¶ 2.) However, there is no guarantee that a revision will be completed by November or that the City will adopt a revision at that time, or at any time thereafter. The Court can only rule based on the current housing element. The instant petition is entitled to preference. (§ 65752.) Further, if the Court were to enter judgment in favor of petitioner, the housing element law provides deadlines for the City to address the deficiencies in the housing element and to submit the revision to HCD. (§ 65754(a).) If respondent were to appeal, the appeal would be given preference also. (§ 65752.) Accordingly, there is no reason to delay ruling on the merits of the operative first amended petition.

### B. Whether Sites Inventory Meets Statutory Requirements

#### 1. Realistic Development Capacity

The inventory in a housing element must "specify for each site the number of units that can realistically be accommodated on that site and whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing, moderate-income housing, or above moderate-income housing." (§ 65583.2(c).) For a city that does not require a

minimum residential density,[2] the city "shall demonstrate how the number of units determined for [each] site...will be accommodated." (§ 65583.2(c)(1).) As part of the calculation, " [t]he number of units calculated...shall be adjusted as necessary, based on the land use controls and site improvements requirement identified in paragraph (5) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, the realistic development capacity for the site, typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction, and on the current or planned availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities." (§ 65583.2(c)(2).)

An "assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs" shall include an "analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels...including land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, local processing and permit procedures, and any locally adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development." (§ 65583(a)(5).)

To demonstrate that its inventory is adequate, respondent relies on a Mixed Use Overlay Zone ("Overlay Zone") adopted by ordinance on November 17, 2020, where the maximum residential density within the zone was increased from 0 in commercial areas to 79.2 units/acre. (JR 200, 209.) The Overlay Zone spans the length of the City from east to west and partially north to south, along its largest commercial corridors, including Wilshire Boulevard, Robertson Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, South Doheny Drive, and South Beverly Drive. (JR 125; *see also* JR 213 [map of Overlay Zone].) In the housing element, the City describes the purported benefits of the Overlay Zone: "This wide-scale rezoning allows for the creation or conversion of non-residential space into residential units, and therefore will create all net new housing, since it does not involve the displacement of any existing occupied housing/residents." (JR 125.)

Respondent argues that the maximum residential density exceeds the minimum 30 units per acre that is statutorily deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income individuals. (§ 65583.2(c)(3)(B)(iv).) Respondent also argues that existing commercial buildings in the Overlay Zone may obtain a permit to convert to a mixed-use building and obtain relief from having to comply with standards concerning parking requirements, loading facilities, outdoor living space, commercial-residential transitional setbacks, or height limits if compliance is physically infeasible. (JR 1636; *see also* Chen Decl. Ex. G [Beverly Hills Municipal Code ("BMMC") § 10-3-1888].) The vacancy rates for commercial buildings also purportedly create an incentive for commercial building owners to convert their buildings to mixed-use projects. (JR 201.)

---

[2] It is undisputed Beverly Hills does not mandate a minimum residential density.

For commercial properties listed in the sites inventory of the housing element that were designated for conversion or indicated as having conversion potential (JR 229-34), to calculate the total number of units on the site, the City multiplied the total parcel size by the maximum allowable residential density.[3] However, the total parcel size listed in the sites inventory refers to land area, not the square footage of the existing building that can accommodate residential units. Contrary to respondent's contention, the sites inventory does not account for floor area capacity; the sites inventory lists the height limit of the building, not the number of stories to be converted to residential use. (*See, e.g.,* JR 229 [column name is "Height Limit (stories)," 233 [8500 Wilshire Blvd. described as "8 story building – conversion," but height limit is 3 stories].) As a result, for buildings to be converted to mixed use, the housing element does not demonstrate how the number of units indicated in the sites inventory will be accommodated, as required by section 65583.2(c)(1).

Moreover, as petitioner points out in the reply, most of the sites in the City's sites inventory are not designated as conversions or potential conversions. (JR 229-34.) For sites not indicated as conversions, any construction of residential units is subject to land use and building controls. For example, multi-family developments are subject to height limits from three to five stories. (JR 153-54.) Any building in the Overlay Zone must include commercial uses on the ground floor, and residential uses on the first floor within the first 40 feet from the street are prohibited. (BMMC §§ 10-3-1877(C), 10-3-1879.) Moreover, each multi-family development must have at least 200 square feet for each dwelling unit, excluding front yards, balconies, and pedestrian accessways. (BHMC §§ 10-3-1886, 10-3-2803.)

The sites inventory contains no adjustment based on land use controls for new construction, as required by section 65583.2(c)(2). Rather, like the sites designated as conversions, the number of units for each site is calculated based on the land area multiplied by the maximum residential density. Moreover, the housing element contains no meaningful consideration and analysis of the governmental constraints on the development of housing, as required by § 65583(a)(5). Rather, the City relies on prior approved and proposed developments in arguing in conclusory fashion that "the current standards are not inhibiting development of housing." (JR 158-159, 203-04.) Accordingly, the housing element, including the sites inventory, fails to account for the realistic development capacity for the sites listed in the inventory.

With respect to respondent's contention that the maximum residential density exceeds the density set forth in section 65583.2(c)(3)(B)(iv), this only means that the

---

[3] For example, for 8730 Wilshire Blvd., the parcel size is 11,863 square feet. (JR 233.) There are 1/43,560 acres in one square foot. (*See* https://www.britannica.com/science/acre-unit-of-measurement [43,560 square feet in 1 acre].) 11,863 square feet multiplied by 1/43,560 acre per square foot is 0.27 acres. 0.27 acres multiplied by 79.2 units per acre is approximately 21 units.

City does not have to provide an analysis demonstrating how its adopted density accommodates its share of the regional housing need for lower income households. (§ 65583.2(c)(3)(A-B).) However, the City still must adjust the number of units for each site based on the realistic development capacity of the site under section 65583.2(c)(1) and (c)(2) and provide an "analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the...development of housing for all income levels" under section 65583(a)(5).

Petitioner also argues that the City designated the majority of the sites on the sites inventory as 100% low-income or 100% moderate-income housing without explaining the basis for such designation. (OB at 10:6-7.) Petitioner further argues that the City did not adjust the unit counts based on "typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction," as required by section 65583.2(c)(2). (OB 10:7-8.)

Petitioner, however, does not reference any statute that requires an explanation for the basis for the low-income or moderate-income housing designation. The housing element law only requires that the City specify "the number of units that can realistically be accommodated on that site and whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing, moderate-income housing, or above moderate-income housing" and demonstrate "how the number of units determined for that site...will be accommodated." (§ 65583.2(c), (c)(1).) The sites inventory indicates the total number of units for each site. (JR 229 ["Total Units" column].) By indicating the number of units that are designated as low-income or moderate-income housing, the City also indicates "whether the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing [or] moderate-income housing." (JR 229 ["Lower" and "Mod" columns].) While the City did not explain how the total number of units will be accommodated for the reasons stated above, the designation of housing as low-income or moderate-income is not deficient.

Nevertheless, it is not apparent from the sites inventory whether the City adjusted the numbers for low-income and moderate-income housing based on "typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at a similar affordability level in that jurisdiction." (§ 65583.2(c)(2).) By multiplying the land area by the maximum residential density of 79.2 units per acre and designating all housing as low- or moderate-income housing, the City assumes that all units built on the site will be low-income or moderate-income housing. The City does not account for the possibility that only a certain percentage of the housing on the site will be designated for residents with low- or moderate-income. A revised housing element would need to contain an adjustment based on typical densities at similar affordability levels.

In sum, with respect to realistic development capacity, the housing element is deficient for the following reasons: (1) for conversions, the sites inventory calculates the total number of units based on a product of land area and the maximum residential density without accounting for the floor area of the building; (2) the sites

inventory does not contain any adjustments based on land use controls for new construction; (3) the housing element contains no analysis of the governmental constraints on the development of housing; and (4) the sites inventory does not contain any adjustments based on typical densities of existing or approved residential developments at similar affordability levels in the City.

2. Nonvacant Sites

For nonvacant sites, the housing element law imposes the following additional requirement:

> [T]he city or county shall specify the additional development potential for each site within the planning period and shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential. The methodology shall consider factors including the extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment to additional residential development, the city's or county's past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development, the current market demand for the existing use, an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development, development trends, market conditions, and regulatory or other incentives or standards to encourage additional residential development on these sites.

(§ 65583.2(g)(1).)

Petitioner argues that the City does not explain how its methodology relates to the sites it has included or excluded in the sites inventory. For underutilized nonvacant sites, respondent explains that it selected sites that were more likely to be redeveloped or converted based on evidence of a lack of investment in the property, such as a lack of maintenance or lack of recent upgrades and improvements; parcels with underutilized improvements; and parcels with existing commercial buildings that are higher than 3 stories but whose floor plan is conducive to residential conversion. (JR 202-03, 210-11.) Respondent also explains that existing uses do not constitute an impediment to additional residential development because the creation of the Overlay Zone creates opportunities for residential development; conversion from non-residential to residential use costs less than new construction; and high residential property values in the City create financial incentives for residential development. (JR 209-10.) However, respondent discusses its methodology for determining development potential generally, without engaging in any site-specific analysis.

Respondent contends that it need not engage in an analysis of the methodology of the development potential for each site. The Court disagrees. Section

65583.2(g)(1) states that, for nonvacant sites, "the city or county shall specify the additional development potential for each site within the planning period and shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential." Reading the subdivision as a whole, the City is required to provide an explanation of the methodology for each site in the sites inventory. Among the factors that the methodology must consider are "the current market demand for the existing use" and "an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development." (§ 65583.2(g)(1).) These factors necessarily relate to specific sites and cannot be discussed generally. Because the Legislature included these factors, the Legislature surely intended that the City provide "an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential" for each site.

Without a site-specific analysis, it is unclear how the methodology was applied. For example, as petitioner points out in the opening brief, the City purports to have excluded commercial buildings that contained medical uses and car dealerships from the sites inventory. (JR 210.) However, the sites inventory includes medical buildings and car dealerships. (*See, e.g.,* JR 229-30 [153 S. Doheny Dr., 239 S. La Cienega Blvd., 8833 W. Olympic Blvd., 8845 W. Olympic Blvd., 9134 W. Olympic Blvd.].) The City does not explain how the existing use does not serve as an impediment to residential development.

For the foregoing reasons, with respect to section 65583.2(g)(1), the housing element is deficient because the City did not provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential for each site, including a discussion of the factors probative of likelihood of redevelopment set forth in section 65583.2(g)(1).

Further, the sites inventory shows that the City is meeting all of its share of the need for lower-income housing through nonvacant sites. Accordingly, section 65583.2(g)(2), quoted below, is implicated:

> In addition to the analysis required in paragraph (1), when a city or county is relying on nonvacant sites described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) to accommodate 50 percent or more of its housing need for lower income households, the methodology used to determine additional development potential shall demonstrate that the existing use identified pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element. An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

(§ 65583.2(g)(2).)

For nonvacant sites, the "Field Notes/Existing Conditions & Analysis for Keeping/Removing" column in the sites inventory only indicates the existing use of the site and whether the site is designated for conversion or has conversion potential. (JR 229-34.) The City does not engage in any discussion of occupancy rates, lease terms, viability of the business operating at the sites. Nor does the City present any other discussion demonstrating that the existing use for each site "does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element." (§ 65583.2(g)(2).) Without any evidence concerning the existing use of each site, the existing use is presumed to impede additional residential development. (*Ibid.*)

Respondent maintains that Culver City and Gardena obtained HCD approval based on a chart similar to its sites inventory. However, unlike Beverly Hills, Gardena's sites inventory sets forth the existing use of each site and why the existing use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period. (Reply RJN Ex. B; cf. Chen Decl. Ex. B at 71 [listing criteria used in selection of sites].) With respect to Culver City, the sites inventory does not set forth the reason why the existing use is likely to be discontinued. (Chen Decl. Ex. A at Appendix B.) However, elsewhere in the housing element, Culver City discusses sites that present opportunities for development based on positive responses from property owners and developers. (Chen Decl. Ex. A at B-9 to B-10.) Unlike Beverly Hills, Culver City discussed how the existing use at certain sites would not impede residential development. Beverly Hills did not engage in any site-specific analysis concerning how the existing use would not impede additional residential development.

Respondent contends that the Court of Appeal in *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193 determined that no site-specific analysis concerning the methodology used to determine development potential and additional development factors is required. This is not quite accurate. In *Martinez*, the Court of Appeal found that section 65583.2(g)(1) "does not mandate the City 'specify the additional development potential for each [nonvacant] site within the planning period and ... provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential' *in the housing element itself*." (*Martinez*, 90 Cal.App.5th at 248-49, emphasis added.) While specification of the additional development potential for each site does not have to be part of the housing element, the City still must demonstrate the additional development potential for each site. In *Martinez*, for example, the City of Clovis provided evidence outside of the housing element to demonstrate the development potential of a nonvacant site. (*Id.* at 249-51.)

Here, there is no analysis of the additional development potential for each site listed in the sites inventory in the housing element or elsewhere. Further, the housing element does not contain findings based on substantial evidence that the existing uses of nonvacant sites are likely to be discontinued, as required by section 65583.2(g)(2).

In sum, with respect to nonvacant sites, the housing element is deficient for the following reasons: (1) the City did not provide an explanation of the methodology used to determine the development potential for each site in the sites inventory, including a discussion of the factors probative of likelihood of redevelopment set forth in section 65583.2(g)(1); and (2) the City fails to demonstrate with substantial evidence that the existing use for each site in the sites inventory does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development during the period covered by the housing element.

C. Specific Sites

Petitioner also contends that certain sites were improperly included in the sites inventory. (OB at 15:6-17:1.) Petitioner maintains that the City did not make the findings based on substantial evidence that are required to rebut the presumption under section 65583.2(g)(2) that the existing use will impede additional residential development. (Reply at 4:13-14.)

However, in contending that additional residential development is not possible on certain sites, petitioner relies on extra-record evidence. For example, for 55 North La Cienega, the sites inventory indicates that the property will have 70 low-income units. (JR 229.) However, petitioner presents a Planning Commission Report and meeting minutes to assert that the City's Planning Commission approved development on the site with only 11 units of very low-income housing. (Gelfand Decl. Exs. C at 1, D at 3-4.)

"[W]here the scope of review of factual findings is substantial evidence, review limited to the administrative record is appropriate because extra-record evidence is irrelevant to whether the agency's decision is supported by substantial evidence." (*Cinema West, LLC v. Baker* (2017) 13 Cal.App.5th 194, 208.) Petitioner cannot challenge the inclusion of sites in the inventory based on extra-record evidence. Ironically, petitioner would have the Court consider the propriety of certain sites based on extra-record evidence, but then bar respondent from presenting extra-record evidence to rebut petitioner's argument. (Reply at 4:18-5:13.)

With respect to sites which petitioner contends are unlikely to disappear based on their existing use (OB at 16:21-17:2; JR 1557-58), the Court already finds that respondent did not make findings based on substantial evidence that the existing use for each nonvacant site in the sites inventory is likely to be discontinued. The City must make such findings in revising the housing element.

## VI. Conclusion

The petition is GRANTED. Pursuant to Local Rule 3.231(n), petitioner shall prepare, serve, and ultimately file a proposed judgment and proposed writ of mandate.

Date: September 12, 2023

HON. CURTIS A. KIN

09/14/2023

CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP

CAL HDF

Dec 1, 2025

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**49 South Van Ness Avenue**
**San Francisco, CA 94103**

**Re: Housing Element Implementation**

**By email:** Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

**Cc:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") and Californians for Homeownership ("CFH") write in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm. We write to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Family Zoning Plan violate state law. Specifically:

1. The City's proposed rezonings will not produce sufficient new housing. This violates commitments the City made when it adopted its Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

2. The City's proposed rezonings add new constraints on housing production. This, again, violates commitments the City made in its Sixth Cycle Housing Element and independently violates the Housing Element Law.

3. The "Housing Choice - San Francisco" program seeks to exempt San Francisco from certain state housing laws. That is illegal.

**If the City does not correct these problems, CalHDF and CFH will challenge the City in court.** As a result of the lawsuit, the City would, potentially, fall out of compliance with the Housing Element Law and face exposure to the "builder's remedy." (See Gov. Code, § 65589.5,

subds. (d)(5), (d)(6).) CalHDF and CFH urge the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance.

## The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

"probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this

method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning. This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

Changes to the planned rezoning since the analysis was conducted have further reduced the amount of new housing that can be expected. The proposed rezoning – specifically, the "Housing Choice - San Francisco" program – has been modified to add new unit mix requirements (see pages 14-15 here) and historic preservation requirements (page 30). The Land Use Committee made these changes despite unambiguous evidence in the record that the changes would reduce new housing's feasibility and reduce the number of new units the rezoning can be expected to create. The problem, then, is *even greater* than what the City Economist's analysis shows.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based

on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF and CFH urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model, such as the City Economist's, shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

## The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

CalHDF and CFH also note that the HCSF program was amended in committee on November 17, 2025 to include additional constraints. The HCSF program now virtually excludes any site in a historic district (see page 30 here). The HCSF now also imposes additional unit mix requirements on new housing projects (see pages 14 and 15 here). With respect to the unit mix requirements, it is silly for San Francisco, a City defined by large, multi-bedroom homes, to require new housing to replicate the bulk of existing housing supply in its bedroom counts. If new housing proposals include fewer bedrooms per unit, on average, that is because San Francisco's existing housing stock is already dominated by multi-bedroom homes; it is natural that new housing will fill a niche that the current housing supply does not.

More importantly, the new unit mix requirements, as well as other new constraints on housing, pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.

## The Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program Cannot Exempt San Francisco from State Law

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

### Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. ( See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[3] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[3] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here and attached to this letter).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for a local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF and CFH point out that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[4] HCD's

[4] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF and CFH remind the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

## The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

## The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, CalHDF and CFH warn the City to take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) 115 Cal.App.5th 111 makes clear that in order to comply with

minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF and CFH therefore urge the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

Sincerely,

Matthew Gelfand
*Californians for Homeownership*

Dylan Casey
*CalHDF*

# Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES

**Report in Support of San Francisco Policy and Practice Review**

Written by:

Moira O'Neill (PI)
Vivek Adury
Eric Biber (Co-PI)
Deborah Le-An Tan
Laura Tepper
Ivy Wang

Prepared for the California Department of Housing and Community Development in partial fulfillment of contract #22-30-002.

Disclaimer: The statements and conclusions in this Report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Acknowledgments:

The following students supported building the entitlement dataset and related data cleaning and analysis for this research during the 2022-2023 academic year: Claire Ching, Riya Chopra, Ryan Denker, Olivia Anne Drew Grimes, Rachel Kinzer, Riley Layman, Lily Roberts, Jackson Smith, and Jenny Tsing. Also, Tim Dodson supported data collection related to determining project intake and notification dates.

## Table of Contents


***Executive Summary*** ..... ***6***

**Background: Why Study San Francisco?** ..... **6**

**Research Questions and Approach** ..... **7**

**Summary of Findings** ..... **9**

**SB 35 fixes planning review for eligible housing developments but is not a complete process fix.** ..... 10

**Unpredictable discretionary review processes create uncertainty and risk—even for code compliant development of any size in any location citywide.** ..... 12

**Timeframes for discretionary approvals increased.** ..... 12

**Local policy and practices are inconsistent with the goals of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act.** ..... 13

**Subjectivity and variability persist in the post-entitlement process.** ..... 15

**Stakeholders suggest local reforms must eliminate discretionary review on some housing or the city will not meet its RHNA or resolve long-standing inequities in land use.** ..... 15

**Conclusion** ..... **16**

***Introduction*** ..... ***17***

***Methods, Data, and Limitations*** ..... ***18***

**Overall Research Approach** ..... **18**

Ongoing Legal Research ..... 19

Our Interpretation of State Law and Definition of "Full Implementation" of State Law ..... 19

Unique Entitlement Dataset ..... 20

2014 - 2017 Observations ..... 21

2018 - 2021 Observations ..... 22

Primary Source Documents ..... 24

Regression Analysis ..... 25

In-Depth Interviews and Meetings and Review of Public Hearings ..... 25

Document Analysis ..... 26

Study and Data Limitations ..... 26

***Findings*** ..... ***28***

**San Francisco's local rules prevent full implementation of the goals and aims of state housing laws.** ..... **29**

**San Francisco Planning fully implemented SB 35, but SB 35 is not a complete process fix.** ..... 30

SB 35 processing timeframes are fast—whereas discretionary building permits typically take years. ..... 30

Developers report that SB 35 transformed planning approval pathways for affordable development. ..... 32

SB 35 does not resolve post-entitlement opposition through appeals. ..... 33

**More developments relied on State Density Bonus Law as compared with prior years, but stakeholders disagree about how easy it is to use the state law.** ..... 36

There was no consensus among developers about how easily developers could use State Density Bonus Law in San Francisco. ..... 38

Both developers and planners shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to helping developers manage requirements under local rules. ..... 38

**Local rules complicate application of the Housing Accountability Act.** ..... 41

**Local rules require entitlement processes begin before the application—and navigate multiple hurdles along the way to approval.** ..... 41

Application intake processes were inconsistent with the PSA but improved marginally over time. ..... 42

**Planning policy relies on exemptions to comply with CEQA, but local rules require additional studies.** ....43
**Risk of costly local appeals drives cautious environmental planning practices that limit the impact of the PSA.** ....46
**Continuances—possibly meant to avoid later challenges through administrative appeal—are frequent.** ....51
Publicly Initiated Exceptional DR occurs frequently and may foster negotiations outside of public hearings. ....51
Developers report that design guidelines are vague and invite subjective conditions of approval. ...53

**Cumulative and unique procedural hurdles create comparatively long entitlement timelines. .... 54**

**Stakeholders report that San Francisco's policy emphasizes project-level adjudication to achieve equitable development outcomes, when what the city needs to achieve equitable development outcomes is zoning and planning reform. .... 56**

**Planners and developers believe San Francisco needs procedural reform that addresses discretionary review, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors agree. .. 58**

**All stakeholder groups report persistent post-entitlement challenges. .... 61**

***Conclusion .... 62***

***Appendix A: Regression Supplement With Methods .... 66***

***Appendix B: Spatial Distribution of Developments .... 86***

***Appendix C: Analysis of Accuracy of Annual Progress Report Data on Entitlements and SB 35 Approvals .... 94***

Table 1: Timeframes to Planning Approvals Issued in 2018 - 2021 Selected Pathways10
Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years .... 21
Table 3: Summary of Total Approvals and Unit Counts Across Study Period .... 28
Table 4: 2018-2021 Approval Observations and Units by Affordability and Process .... 28
Table 5: Entitlement Timeframe by Approval Pathway 2018-2021 .... 31
Table 6: Median Project Size by Product Type and Approval Pathway .... 37
Table 7: Frequency of Use of Density Bonus (All Programs)[1] .... 40
Table 8: PPA to Application Timeframes .... 42
Table 9: Analysis of Application Status Notifications .... 43
Table 10: CEQA Compliance Pathways .... 45
Table 11: Total Time Spent on All CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 N=48 .... 50
Table 12: Total Time Spent on CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 for CALES Observations ... 50
Table 13: Total Cost CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 (N=48) .... 50
Table 14: Total Cost CEQA Appeals CALES Housing Only (N=19) .... 50
Table 15: Comparison of Entitlements Requiring CPEs Oakland-San Francisco 2014 - 2017 data .... 55
Table 16: Variation in Number of Approval Steps, by Process Categories, Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2018 - 2021 (N=111) .... 72
Table 17: All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 .... 75
Table 18: Regression Using 100 CPE Observations 2014 - 2017 .... 77

Table 19: Regression All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2014 - 2021 With Controls..... 79
Table 20: Regression Results, Dropping Approval Step Outliers (2014 - 2021 Data)... 80

Figure 1 Process Approval Pathway Timeframes..... 11
Figure 2 Comparison of Timeframes by Affordability Classification, All Years ..... 13
Figure 3 Distribution of Affordable Units by Development Type ..... 33
Figure 4 CEQA Milestone Timelines Categorical Exemptions Only (2018-2021)..... 47
Figure 5 CEQA Milestone Timelines Multiple Pathways (2018-2021) ..... 48
Figure 6 Regression 2018-2021 Observations (No Controls)..... 69
Figure 7 Ordinary Least Squares Regression 2014-2017 Observations (N=140)..... 76
Figure 8 Regression All Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2014-2021 (No Controls) ..... 78
Figure 9 Correlation Heat Map for 2018-2021 Regression Data (N=111) with Affordability, Neighborhood, and Process Characteristics..... 82
Figure 10 Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression (“No Controls” in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018-2021 ..... 83
Figure 11 Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression (“All Controls” in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018-2021..... 84

# Executive Summary

## Background: Why Study San Francisco?

San Francisco is the anchor city in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) region, with one of the highest Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) statewide. Complex processes that lead to delayed housing development approvals leave open questions about whether San Francisco's local legal regime will allow the city to meet this housing production target.

In 2016, authors O'Neill, Biber, and students launched the Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) at the University of California, Berkeley, to understand how cities, including San Francisco, design and apply local and state law to proposed developments of five or more units approved in 2014 - 2017. In an earlier report,[1] we found San Francisco's local regulatory regime comparatively prohibitive, risking exclusionary zoning despite explicit policies to promote inclusion and fair housing goals through inclusionary housing programs, rent stabilization, and tenant protections. Among the 28 jurisdictions we studied, San Francisco was among the cities with more land zoned for dense housing, although that zoning was not equitably distributed citywide. But most notable, among all our study cities, San Francisco was an *extreme* outlier in process requirements and timeframes to approval. The city had a median timeframe to entitlement of over two years for code compliant multi-family housing that benefited from streamlined environmental review.

San Francisco's median timeframe was not only longer than its neighbors, it was longer than timeframes in neighboring cities with purportedly more difficult local law. Berkeley, for example, has complex rules that require a use permit[2] for all new housing development, and yet the median timeframe to entitlement was four months shorter for comparable multi-family housing. Moreover, once we parsed out our data to explore how environmental review streamlining might impact timelines, we found that Berkeley's median timeframe dropped to less than 10 months for apartment buildings, whereas San Francisco's remained at 24 months for the *same type of housing*. San Francisco exemplified how cities can write and implement procedural rules in a manner that creates uncertainty of approval. Uncertainty creates risk, and risk influences what developers will propose and build, as well as which developers will consider developing within a city. During our research, affordable developers who worked in neighboring cities explained they could not work within San Francisco because entitlement was too uncertain and difficult.

California's legislature has passed nearly 100 laws relevant to housing policy since 2016.[3] These laws seek to spur housing production across all income levels and promote equitable housing outcomes—namely increased housing production in high opportunity locations. Many important changes to state housing law target subjectivity in discretionary processes, like

---

[1] We refer here to our Report to the California Air Resources Board in fulfillment of Contract #3900-19STC005. MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS (2022). We also cross reference prior publications.

[2] Project proponents apply for a use permit, often referred to as a conditional use permit, when local rules allow for certain uses subject to approval—but not as a matter of right under the local zoning.

[3] *See* Ben Metcalf, Managing Dir., UC Berkeley, Terner Ctr. for Hous. Innovation, Presentation at the California Joint Oversight Hearing with Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee: Housing Production: Recent Legislative Actions and Outcomes (Feb. 28, 2023), https://shou.senate.ca.gov/node/21.

planning review,[4] and work towards quickening approval processes, particularly for multi-family housing. New law and policy aim to accelerate housing production in high opportunity areas, inviting important questions about how well San Francisco has implemented these laws and whether they effectuate production, affordability, and equity. To answer these questions, we expanded and extended CALES to explore San Francisco's local land use regulation in more detail and identify specific roadblocks to dense multi-family housing. This report details our methods, presents findings, and discusses their implications for the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Policy and Practice Review.

## Research Questions and Approach

HCD asked (1) whether San Francisco is fully implementing key state housing laws, such as the Housing Accountability Act, the Housing Crisis Act, the Permit Streamlining Act, Senate Bill 35 (SB 35), and State Density Bonus Law; (2) whether local implementation is allowing these state laws to achieve their intended effect of promoting housing production and affordability; (3) what causes delay in the entitlement process and how the city's discretionary review process impacts overall project timelines and the housing approvals pipeline.

To answer these questions, we used a spiraling mixed methods research design that joins legal research and qualitative, quantitative, and spatial analyses to understand San Francisco's local regulatory environment. This design helped our study overcome some of the limitations of each method and allowed us to adapt our research approach to the specific needs of studying San Francisco.

HCD's questions one and two require us to interpret our data and provide findings based on our interpretation of what state law requires of localities.[5] For example, we interpret the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act as applicable to all multi-family housing approvals in San Francisco that do not require a local legislative action. We define "full implementation" of these state laws to mean that San Francisco both complies with state law, but also that local rules or planning practices do not effectively circumvent the purpose of the limitations imposed on cities by state law.

We built a unique and highly detailed dataset of 140 planning entitlements[6] of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017. We added 144 observations of entitlements and SB 35 approvals issued

---

[4] For a discussion of what characterizes a discretionary action, see Friends of Westwood, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 181 Cal. App. 3d 259, 269-74 (1987). When city employees can set standards and conditions for many aspects of a proposed building, the approval process is discretionary. For a definition of a ministerial process in California law, see Prentiss v. City of S. Pasadena, 15 Cal. App. 4th 85, 90, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641 (1993) (citing CAL. CODE REGS., tit.14, § 15268(b)(1) (2023)("'Ministerial' describes a governmental decision involving little or no personal judgment by the public official as to the wisdom or manner of carrying out the project. The public official merely applies the law to the facts as presented but uses no special discretion or judgment in reaching a decision. A ministerial decision involves only the use of fixed standards or objective measurements, and the public official cannot use personal, subjective judgment in deciding whether or how the project should be carried out.")). Importantly, ministerial decisions are exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

[5] We discuss this in the report; our analysis depends on some assumptions about what "full" implementation of state law would entail.

[6] We refer to "entitlement" as a process and "entitlement" as an observation of that process in the singular and plural throughout this report. Entitlement refers to the type of housing approval that a project proponent secures from the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or Board of Supervisors when

in 2018 - 2021 to this dataset.[7] Our approvals dataset captured detail on each application and approval step under local rules and state law (like the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA) and important project characteristics (like affordability, building size, and location). We gathered the detail for our dataset from source documents (application documents, planning staff reports, and motion and resolution documents) wherever possible. We analyzed our data using statistics and mapping.

We conducted in-depth interviews and used participant observation and primary document analysis to understand why San Francisco's approval process operates the way that it does. We analyzed more than 35 hours of confidential in-depth research interviews with 24 participants representing affordable and market-rate developers, former and current city personnel and staff that work on housing development, land use attorneys, and housing advocates.[8] We observed and analyzed notes and transcripts from another 33 meetings that HCD convened with approximately 146 stakeholders. Most were approximately one hour long. Twenty-five of the HCD-led meetings were very small, with one to three participants, in addition to O'Neill and one representative from HCD. The small meetings allowed participants to offer deep insights, much like research interviews. In all, we analyzed notes and transcripts from ~68 hours of research interviews and meetings with 14 individuals across the executive and legislative bodies within San Francisco, over 20 former and current planning staff, more than 60 development professionals (evenly split between affordable and market-rate developers), and 6 different housing advocacy groups. We analyzed materials to extract themes and looked for frequency of themes across stakeholder groups. We also cross-referenced written law, recordings from hearings, approval documents, and analyses from our entitlement data.

### Limitations of Research Approach and Analysis

Each method and data point has some limitations. For example, each observation in our approval dataset represents a potential housing or mixed-use development that developers believed had a high enough probability of success that they were willing to pursue entitlement in the first place. There are no project denials in the database to allow for quantitative analysis, but we do have limited data on a few denials we examined during data collection. Gathering data on project denials in a systematic way (for quantitative analysis) would demand substantially expanding the scope of the research project, which was not feasible given the research timeframe. Further, defining a project denial for data collection and analysis is more complex than defining an entitlement. A denial includes what the city reports as a denial but should also include projects that the city effectively "denied" (where a political body denied a specific entitlement, for example) even though the project remains pending within the city's public portal

---

the local law reviews a proposal to build housing through a discretionary process. Discretionary review is a legal concept that means the city can set standards and conditions for many aspects of a proposed building and the approval process is discretionary. An entitlement typically precedes the building permit process, and it is a process that involves planning department review of a proposal to build housing and potentially requires an approval from a local elected or appointed political body. A ministerial process involves a public official applying law to fact without discretion or subjective judgment. Often, building departments issue ministerial approvals. Uniquely, state law creates a ministerial process that also involves planning review—which we discuss at length in the full report.

[7] Corrected Annual Progress Reports helped us identify 11 observations late in our research process. We were able to code essential characteristics for these 11 observations to include them in our summary statistical analyses only.

[8] Eighteen participants sat for interviews in 2022 - 2023, and several participated in more than one interview. We also analyzed transcripts from six interviews across the same stakeholder groups in San Francisco (affordable developers, planners, market-rate developers, and community-based organization advocates) that O'Neill conducted in 2017, where comparisons with prior years was useful.

or in its annual reporting. For the purposes of research, a denial could also include a project from which a developer appears to voluntarily withdraw after the city determines that it will not approve the project or will impose conditions that render the project infeasible. There also may be no documentation to verify whether a project that appears to be pending has effectively been denied. In our work, however, where we come across developments that have advanced in the entitlement process but are ultimately denied, we do discuss those developments.

All interview participants volunteered, as did all participants in HCD-led meetings. Voluntary participation in interviews and research meetings increases selection bias and limits the generalizability of findings.[9] We increased the number of interviews in each stakeholder group and triangulated data and methods to augment the overall reliability of our findings from interviews where possible. Some topics do not allow for this, however. For example, developers may discuss why they are unwilling to apply for entitlement, but there is no other data to explore to understand what deters applications beyond what the interview participants shared.

## Summary of Findings

HCD asked whether the data indicates San Francisco has fully implemented state housing law intended to promote housing production and affordability. **All data generally indicates that the answer is no.**

San Francisco's local rules embed subjectivity and uncertainty into review processes that state law says should be objective, time constrained, and, in some cases, certain. The city's authority to apply discretionary review to any permit, and the ease with which project opponents can appeal planning approvals and permits (including post-entitlement permits) to the Board of Supervisors or Board of Appeals fosters planning practices that limit full implementation of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, and in some instances, SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law. Planning staff are concerned about whether planning review will survive scrutiny from local political bodies, not the courts. Planning staff anticipate local political bodies will ignore planning recommendations and extend review processes if that is what neighborhood-level politics demand. Planning practices reflect this assumption, and local policy reinforces it. Developers interpret this planning practice as requiring more than what the law "on paper" demands through negotiation outside of public hearings to satisfy neighborhood interests. Developers perceive all planning approvals as uncertain and risky, even if the proposed development conforms to all zoning and planning standards. Eight years of approvals data confirms these perceptions. The risk and uncertainty embedded into local law has driven some developers to leave the San Francisco market and has deterred other developers from entering the market entirely.

Below, we elaborate on what the data tells us about the direct effects of specific state housing laws on San Francisco's housing approval process, what all data tells us about San Francisco's implementation of different state laws, and the relationship between local rules, planning practices, and lengthy entitlement outcomes. The report that follows details each finding.

[9] Selection bias refers to research participants not being fully representative of the group to which they belong. This limits our ability to interpret what we hear as the perspectives of a particular stakeholder group, generally.

## SB 35 fixes planning review for eligible housing developments but is not a complete process fix.

Data shows San Francisco Planning diligently implemented SB 35. Approximately 36 professionals who work on affordable development unanimously reported that SB 35's ministerial process "fixed" planning review for affordable housing developments because the state law created certainty of planning approval where none existed previously. Stakeholder perceptions are borne out in the planning approval data. Table 1 shows that the median timeframe for planning approval for developments that applied only under SB 35 was ~3.4 months and could take up to eight months. In contrast, code compliant discretionary developments[10] requiring only a building permit had a median timeframe of two years and could take as many as four years.

*Table 1: Timeframes to Planning Approvals Issued in 2018 - 2021 Selected Pathways*

| Process Category | Timeframe (Months) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Minimum | **Median** | **Mean** | Maximum |
| SB 35 only (N=9)[1] | 0.89 | 3.42 | 4.24 | 7.62 |
| Discretionary building permit only (N=13) | 7.76 | 24.20 | 24.67 | 47.70 |

[1]This count does not include five applications that developers proposed as discretionary approvals, some before SB 35's enactment, that San Francisco later approved under SB 35.

Importantly, stakeholder interviews indicate SB 35 provided both affordable developers and planning staff relief from San Francisco's local rules. Data on how San Francisco Planning processed applications for development before SB 35 indicates Planning prioritized expediting 100% affordable developments.[11] Local law still limited how quickly planners could complete review for any development, including 100% affordable development that the city helped fund. In fact, the city entitled only five 100% affordable developments in 2014 – 2017, which would yield 567 units if built. The median timeframe to approval for these five 100% affordable developments was 15 months. In contrast, SB 35's ministerial process allowed San Francisco Planning to approve 14 100% affordable developments that would yield 1,663 affordable units if built. The median timeframe for the SB 35 100% affordable developments was less than 7.5 months, inclusive of developments that began as discretionary developments and later applied for SB 35 eligibility review. The median timeframe for 100% affordable housing developments that only applied for approval under SB 35 was less than three months. Most SB 35 developments also used State Density Bonus Law, so they were, on average, larger as compared with another three discretionary 100% affordable developments San Francisco approved in 2018 – 2021, or the five entitled in 2014 - 2017.

However, SB 35's effects are limited to planning review. All stakeholders still describe the post-entitlement approval process as subjective, lacking standardization and sufficient oversight.

[10] Code compliant discretionary development means proposed housing development that conforms to all zoning and only requires a building permit. San Francisco law provides that this development is subject to discretionary review.

[11] Interviews at that time indicated internal work and analysis to expedite affordable development, but median timeframes for 100% affordable developments were still 15 months.

Stakeholders share that the post-entitlement permitting process depends entirely on the professional assigned to the project, not the project scope itself. Stakeholders report that subjectivity in the post-entitlement process can trigger additional planning review even after a project has moved to the Department of Building Inspection. Because SB 35 is limited to the planning review stage, the state law has no effect on these post-entitlement procedural issues. Developers share that because San Francisco's law offers opportunities for project opponents to challenge, or appeal, permits after entitlement, including demolition permits, SB 35 eligible projects are susceptible to process challenges after planning review as well.[12]

SB 35 also does not represent a complete fix for San Francisco's procedural challenges. SB 35 applies to qualifying projects so long as San Francisco keeps failing to meet its housing production targets. But missing housing production targets is not San Francisco's goal. **Still, San Francisco's implementation of SB 35 signals what is possible with a ministerial process while also spotlighting San Francisco's problematic existing discretionary review.**

*Figure 1: Process Approval Pathway Timeframes*




Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

[12] The recent appeal of demolition permits for an SB 35 development located at 2550 Irving demonstrates this point.

## Unpredictable discretionary review processes create uncertainty and risk—even for code compliant development of any size in any location citywide.

All permits in San Francisco are discretionary under local law unless preempted by state law[13] (like SB 35). Stakeholders describe the discretionary housing approval process in San Francisco as risky and unpredictable. Stakeholders report approval is uncertain even if the proposal conforms to all zoning and planning requirements. When we use different statistical methods to analyze the housing approval data, we also find that **no type of housing development is easy to entitle in San Francisco**. Even a smaller development that conforms to zoning and planning requirements faces unpredictable timeframes. When we analyze the approvals data to explore relationships between specific approval requirements and timeframes, we discover that there are factors—like affordability classification, project size, and location—outside of what zoning and planning standards require that influence timeframes. This suggests that these other factors might play a substantial role in whether and how a project gets entitled, even when a project conforms to all planning standards and zoning.

## Timeframes for discretionary approvals increased.

Our 2018 - 2021 approvals data indicates that entitlement timeframes have increased as compared to the prior four years. The median timeframe for discretionary approvals of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017 was 27 months. In 2018 - 2021, the median timeframe for the same climbed to 34 months—more than a 25% increase. Figure 2 shows that in both study periods, 100% affordable development moved comparatively faster: 100% affordable development requiring discretionary review had median approval timeframes of ~15 months in 2014 - 2017 and ~20 months in 2018 – 2021. Both periods show that the city can quicken the process, to some degree, for affordable development. Interview data from 2017 and 2022 - 2023 indicate that planning staff have been committed to expediting affordable development.

[13] The Municipal Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 26(a) provides that San Francisco's departments may "take into consideration the effects of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents . . . [and to] exercise its [or their] sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked." SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., BUS. & TAX REGS. CODE § 26(a) (2019). San Francisco Planning's website states that the city interprets this part of the Municipal Code as granting the Planning Commission discretionary authority over all building permits, including permits not otherwise discretionary under zoning and planning requirements. *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).

*Figure 2: Comparison of Timeframes by Affordability Classification, All Years*




Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

## Local policy and practices are inconsistent with the goals of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act.

Stakeholders report that San Francisco's local rules and politics create planning practices that are inconsistent with state housing laws which aim to quicken planning review and reduce subjectivity. Approvals data suggests these stakeholders are correct.

**First, the data the city makes publicly available on project applications shows San Francisco systematically failed to meet PSA notification deadlines for discretionary approvals issued in 2018 - 2021**. Planning recorded more information on application notices in its public portal for applications filed after January 1, 2018, as compared to prior years, indicating that San Francisco Planning is doing more to track and disclose project intake. Still, the city's data shows the city routinely did not meet PSA deadlines. Also, up until July 2023, local policy required the entitlement process for most dense development to begin with a mandatory Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) process that added, on average, a year to the application process.

**Second, local rules drive the city's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which extends timelines**. Local rules that allow for easy administrative appeals and require appeal of CEQA determinations to follow entitlement[14] push environmental planners to make CEQA determinations at the close of the entitlement process. This practice limits the PSA's effect on overall approval timeframes.[15] Also, the state's CEQA guidelines do not require San Francisco Planning to incorporate wind and shadow studies into compliance pathways for exempt developments, but local law does. These supplemental studies add time

[14] The Board of Supervisors provides an advisory that explains that Section 31.16 of its Administrative Code requires that the Board will hear an appeal after the final approval action. *See* S.F. BD. OF SUPERVISORS, APPEAL FILING TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) EXEMPTION DETERMINATIONS APPEAL (Aug. 28, 2023), https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/CEQA_Exemption_Determinations_Appeal_Info_Sheet.pdf.

[15] We interpret California Government Code § 65690(a) as imposing limits on the time to approval under the PSA only after a city makes CEQA determinations. *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65690(a) (West 2023).

and cost to environmental review, and sometimes provide a basis for local administrative appeals.[16]

**Third, and relatedly, administrative appeals not only delay entitlement for specific projects that face appeal, administrative appeals also influence planning practices at a systems level.** Most stakeholders (across groups) perceive that San Francisco's process risks inserting the Board of Supervisors into any approval pathway through an appeal. This process nurtures risk averse planning practices at all stages which derail other local and state policy that aims to quicken review. Data also shows that appeals increase the workload for planners already juggling immense workloads, which in turn impacts the pace of review for other development proposals. For example, **an administrative appeal of just one entitlement in our dataset required 374 additional staff hours and $52,204 to prepare the appeal—even though the appeal was withdrawn**. Notably, nearly all the planners we interviewed or met with are more apprehensive of the Board of Supervisors than potential litigants.

**Fourth, stakeholders report frequent continuances and multiple hearings for non-CEQA approvals, which they say also allows for changes to proposed development outside of formal hearings.** San Francisco's publicly accessible data on hearing dates is incomplete for about half of our 2018 – 2021 observations. Still, we found that at least 22% of all 2018 – 2021 quasi-adjudicative entitlements had multiple continuances or hearings for a single step.[17] Some observations have remarkably high rates of continuances and hearings. One project, for example, had nine continuances for a joined Large Project Authorization and Density Bonus approval step.

**Fifth, several stakeholder groups report that local policy allows frivolous and meritless challenges with ease (evidenced by withdrawn or denied appeals or withdrawn or denied requests for exceptional discretionary review)[18] and with little to no cost to project opponents, yet significant costs to planning staff and developers**. Project proponents see increased costs because of the delays and uncertainty that these processes create. The processes also impact the workflow of Planning Department staff, which slows down planning review. For example, data shows that when project opponents request exceptional discretionary review, planners can expect to work several days and sometimes weeks preparing for a hearing on a project with which they already completed review. This requires shuffling work priorities. Developers report that rules that make it easy to challenge imminent planning approvals foster an opaque practice of negotiation outside of formal hearings which risks imposition of subjective conditions of approval. The approvals data show at least 14% of entitlements (across both study periods—or eight years) faced administrative appeals that were usually withdrawn or denied.[19]

---

[16] We note here that San Francisco's public portal only provides access to shadow studies, although many stakeholders including planners stated that wind studies are common.

[17] This includes entitlements that only required a planning department or zoning administrator review. If we take out those entitlements that did not require a hearing in front of the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors under planning and zoning law, the rate is at least 30%.

[18] Exceptional discretionary review refers to a local rule that allows project opponents to request the Planning Commission exercise discretionary review for an approval that did not otherwise require the Planning Commission's involvement. This request necessitates a hearing, at which time the Planning Commission then determines if it will exercise discretionary review because of exceptional and extraordinary circumstances which could lead to modifying the conditions of approval. More detail on this local process is in the full report. We refer to this as "exceptional discretionary review" hereafter.

[19] Administrative appeal data for 2018 - 2021 depends on internal tracking and self-reported data and is not systematically available on the city's public portal. It is possible that the rate of administrative appeal could be higher.

Also, at least 20% of discretionary building permits in study years received a request for exceptional discretionary review.

## Subjectivity and variability persist in the post-entitlement process.

All stakeholders experienced with development in San Francisco shared that the permitting process lacks standardization or uniformity in how the process unfolds. Outcomes, in terms of processing time, are contingent on who is assigned to the development rather than on the form of the development. This variability slows, and sometimes derails, production. Stakeholders describe building permit processes as inefficient and subjective, triggering planning review again even after entitlement. There is also notable difference in the way all stakeholders describe Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) staff. Stakeholders blame local approval bodies for overly cautious planning practices. In contrast, stakeholders complain of too little oversight or management of DBI staff, and too few performance standards, as influencing permitting practices.

## Stakeholders suggest local reforms must eliminate discretionary review on some housing or the city will not meet its RHNA or resolve long-standing inequities in land use.

Importantly, planners, developers, and many housing advocates welcomed the state's intervention into local discretion through SB 35. Though planners expressed a need for more technical support from the state when state law augments local planning review, planners agreed with developers that the state ministerial process fixed planning review for most 100% affordable development and offered that a ministerial process could do the same for other housing projects.

Stakeholder groups also shared that reforms to expedite and simplify planning review while retaining discretion will fail to fix process problems in San Francisco. Statistical analysis of approvals data suggests these stakeholders are correct. Planning review of code compliant development can take years. This is true, even though our timeline calculations do not capture the frequency of developments subject to discretionary review being punted back to Planning *after* entitlement for further additional review, because San Francisco's public data portal does not allow for systematic analysis of this problem. Regression analysis suggests that reducing process steps while maintaining discretionary review is unlikely to resolve San Francisco's production challenges.[20]

**Stakeholders shared that rezoning must be coupled with procedural reform that provides a local ministerial process to address production challenges *and* equity**. Planners, developers, and some housing advocates perceive current reform efforts as "tinkering" with the zoning and planning code, when what they believe is needed is procedural overhaul and equitable upzoning. Stakeholders characterize San Francisco's existing regulation as reflecting historical and current power imbalances across neighborhoods. Stakeholders caution that current density and use controls that limit housing development in more affluent neighborhoods reflect existing neighborhood power over planning and political bodies. Also, the dominance of project-level adversarial politics reflects that some communities can only access power over land use by blocking development at public hearings. When affluent neighborhoods are rezoned, stakeholders caution that neighborhood power and influence over planning and

[20] Figure 8 illustrates. For a full discussion of regression analysis using the 2014 - 2021 data, see Appendix A.

political bodies will not necessarily disappear. Without a ministerial process for at least some development, stakeholders caution that rezoning will simply catalyze more project-by-project adjudication and administrative appeals as affluent communities block more equitable distribution of dense housing development through existing process tools. If what stakeholders forecast is correct—and the data suggests that they are—then existing timelines to approval likely underestimate future approval timeframes in higher opportunity neighborhoods that the city is in the process of upzoning or proposing to upzone.

Planners, developers, and advocates share that these local rules requiring reform are values-driven. These rules reflect a widespread assumption that more process supports meaningful community engagement and sharing of power over land use which, together, help address structural inequities in the built environment. Several stakeholder groups caution that these assumptions are faulty. San Francisco's process fosters project-level political fights that result in high-risk entitlement processes without altering longstanding inequities in planning standards and zoning. Planners, in particular, share that what San Francisco needed, and still needs, is deep engagement at the policy, planning, and zoning stages to hash out what zoning and planning standards should be, as well as simplified and ministerial approval for development at the project level that serves the city's housing policy goals. Planners and developers caution that as process has gotten worse in recent years, fewer developers can navigate the risk of developing in San Francisco, and this poses major challenges to San Francisco's ability to meet its production targets. During meetings with HCD, some Commissioners and Supervisors called out this local history and the problems of process in San Francisco, seemingly aligned with the perspectives of planners, affordable developers, and housing advocates. At the same time, meetings with both Commissioners and Supervisors also revealed clear disagreement within political bodies on both the source of San Francisco's housing problems and the solution. At least some Supervisors are skeptical that increasing anything other than affordable housing production could tackle the city's housing challenges. Some Commissioners and Supervisors also expressed concern about how State Density Bonus Law and SB 35 alter the urban form, even as they want more affordability. And at least some Supervisors perceived affordability to be welcome citywide, whereas planners and affordable developers say that this is not true.

## Conclusion

San Francisco's planning practice and process problems spring from local law that applies discretionary review to any permit and offers repeated opportunities to challenge project approvals after an already complex and lengthy planning review process. These rules incentivize risk averse planning practices to avoid disruptions to a busy workflow and public scrutiny from political bodies. Risk averse planning practices, in turn, limit full implementation of the Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, and in some instances, State Density Bonus Law. Local rules also limit the effects of SB 35, as affordable developers face post-entitlement appeals. Still, the direct effects of state ministerial review highlight what is possible in terms of resolving San Francisco's process issues. Planners, developers, and housing advocates suggest achievement of the city's equity goals requires a local ministerial process coupled with equitable upzoning. What is also apparent, however, is that reforming zoning and entitlement will be insufficient to attain production targets. The city has major challenges with post-entitlement processes—some of which are related, again, to local rules, and some of which are related to variability and subjectivity in permitting processes, staffing, and lack of inter-agency coordination.

# Introduction

In 2016, we launched the Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) at UC Berkeley. CALES explores how communities design and apply land use law to proposals to build dense housing. We used a 2015 California Legislative Analyst's Office report that identified the metro areas with the highest housing costs in the state and where demand has outpaced supply[21] to select our first group of study cities and regions. San Francisco was at the top of the list, and we began our work by studying San Francisco and four neighboring cities.[22] We eventually grew the study to include 28 jurisdictions in seven metropolitan regions across the state.

What we found was that San Francisco zoned comparatively more land for dense housing than nearly every other city we studied across the state. Indeed, San Francisco was one of only *two* cities studied that zoned more than a third of its zoned land for all income levels.[23] Zoning land for dense multi-family housing is a necessary though insufficient condition to achieving affordability and inclusion. California's fair share housing law is premised on this concept.[24]

Despite San Francisco zoning more land for dense housing than most cities studied, we found that San Francisco's local regulatory regime was comparatively prohibitive and risked exclusion. Even though the city has explicit local policy to promote inclusion and fair housing goals through inclusionary housing programs, rent stabilization, and tenant protections, our comparative analysis categorized San Francisco as "prohibitive" due to its complex procedural maze and application of laws. Among the 28 jurisdictions studied, San Francisco was unique in that it made all development discretionary. No other city we studied made all building permits (typically issued post-entitlement) discretionary; most used aesthetic regulation or design or site plan review as the blanket discretionary hook during entitlement. A few of our study cities required use permits for all multi-family housing development. But all the other approaches we found existed in the planning code and zoning regulations. No other city studied made building permits discretionary through some other area of local law.

San Francisco was also an extreme outlier in terms of timeframes to entitlement—with median timeframes of over two years, even for housing developments that met all zoning requirements and planning standards. These lengthy timeframes eclipsed the other study cities' timeframes by many months. These timelines also exceeded planner perceptions of "average" entitlement timeframes in communities nationwide. We found that only 5% of the 140 project observations in our 2014 - 2017 dataset from San Francisco achieved entitlement in 12 months or less.

We wrote that San Francisco's land use regime exemplifies how cities can zone land for dense multi-family housing and write and implement procedural rules to create delay and uncertainty of approval. Delay creates cost. Uncertainty creates risk. Increased development costs and risk influences which developers will build within a place, and what those developers will build. In that prior research, interview data and 2014 - 2017 approvals data suggested San Francisco's local regulatory regime burdened affordable development—even if the city prioritized affordable

---

[21] CHAS ALAMO ET AL., LEGIS. ANALYST'S OFF., CALIFORNIA'S HIGH HOUSING COSTS: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES (2015), https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.aspx.
[22] We refer here to our Report to the California Air Resources Board in fulfillment of Contract #3900-19STC005. MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS (2022).
[23] *Id.*
[24] *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65583.2 (West 2023).

development—and likely squeezed out possibilities for middle income housing development entirely. We found that San Francisco's local law facilitated most 2014 - 2017 entitlement being sited in formerly industrial locations or neighborhoods that had multi-family zoning in place for decades. What we concluded was that San Francisco was the most sophisticated of the cities we studied in how its local law effectively blocked dense housing development through complex procedural hurdles rather than traditional density and use constraints.

California's legislature has passed nearly 100 laws relevant to housing policy since 2016[25] to spur housing production across all income levels and promote equitable housing outcomes. Many important changes target subjectivity in planning review and aim to quicken planning review, particularly for multi-family housing. There is also new law and policy to accelerate equitable housing outcomes, in terms of increased production in high opportunity locations.

More recent legislative reforms invite important questions about how well San Francisco has implemented these state housing laws intended to promote housing production, affordability, and equity. To explore these questions, we expanded and extended our Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) to better understand San Francisco's local land use regulatory regime and identify roadblocks to all multi-family housing development approvals that would yield five or more units. This report details our methods, presents findings, and discusses their implications for the California Department of Housing and Community Developments' (HCD) Policy and Practice Review.

# Methods, Data, and Limitations

HCD asked:

1) At the local level, are state housing laws (including the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, Permit Streamlining Act, State Density Bonus Law, SB 35, and Housing Element Law) intended to promote housing production and affordability being fully implemented, and are they achieving their intended effect?
2) What are the causes of delay in San Francisco's entitlement process?
3) To what extent do discretionary review processes impact overall project timelines and the housing approvals pipeline?

## Overall Research Approach

We use a spiraling mixed methods research design that joins legal research and qualitative, quantitative, and spatial analyses to understand San Francisco's local regulatory environment and answer the research questions. A spiraling research design is iterative and allows us to reexamine theoretical assumptions and methodological choices throughout the research process. This iterative research approach is sensitive to local conditions and research needs that are sometimes difficult to discover at the beginning of a research process. This approach involves producing analysis at multiple points in the study to allow for a feedback loop with both HCD and San Francisco while also informing our own theoretical assumptions about which law, policy, or planning practice factors support or obstruct housing development. This approach also means we do not rely exclusively on qualitative, quantitative, or spatial analysis to answer any

[25] *See* Ben Metcalf, Managing Dir., UC Berkeley, Terner Ctr. for Hous. Innovation, Presentation at the California Joint Oversight Hearing with Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee: Housing Production: Recent Legislative Actions and Outcomes (Feb. 28, 2023), https://shou.senate.ca.gov/node/21.

research question. We use qualitative data (interviews) to understand our quantitative and spatial analysis (using our entitlement dataset) and vice versa.

### Ongoing Legal Research

We completed initial legal research into San Francisco's planning and zoning through CALES in 2016. We updated that legal research in 2018 and 2019, and then again in 2021 to understand changes to local planning review processes (for example, the elimination of the pre-application Environmental Evaluation process in 2018) and the impact of state housing laws (including changes to Density Bonus Law, Accessory Dwelling Unit Law, Senate Bill 330, SB 35, and amendments to the Housing Accountability Act), wherever changes are codified or provided for in policy documents. The legal and planning code summary informs our interview questions and guides our current data collection process. In the scope of this work, we updated our review of local law with relevant trial court and appellate court opinions.

### Our Interpretation of State Law and Definition of "Full Implementation" of State Law

Answering the first research question requires us to explore whether San Francisco's policy and practices comply with state law and whether San Francisco's local policy or practices prevent specific state laws from achieving their intended effect. This requires us, first, to interpret state law and define what it means for a locality to fully implement each law for the purposes of this research. How we define "full implementation" in the research questions also informs our methods of analysis. We list our understanding of the applicability of specific state laws, their aims, and our definition of "full implementation" here.

We interpret the PSA, Housing Accountability Act, and Housing Crisis Act as applicable to *all* discretionary approvals, or entitlements, in San Francisco that do not require local legislative action. We read provisions within San Francisco's Planning Code that allow for and anticipate that the Planning Commission will issue a waiver or exception from any planning standards or zoning *without* local legislative action as adjudicative and within the purview of these state laws.

We interpret the goal of the PSA as seeking to "expedite decisions" on qualifying development projects[26] by imposing time limits on application processing and approval decisions. We also interpret the Permit Streamlining Act as imposing limits on the time to approval under the Permit Streamlining Act only after a city makes CEQA determinations.[27] If our data shows that a local policy or practice prevents the Permit Streamlining from imposing those time limits, we conclude that the local policy or practice blocks the full implementation of the PSA, even if the data does not show San Francisco violated an express provision of the PSA.

We interpret that the goal of the Housing Accountability Act is to increase housing production by limiting the ability of cities to outright deny, reduce the density of, or render infeasible a development that complies with objective development standards. We interpret the Housing Accountability Act to prohibit these actions unless a locality provides written findings that the proposed development would have an unavoidable and impossible to mitigate adverse impact on public health or safety.[28] Relatedly, we interpret the 2017 amendments to the Housing Accountability Act, found in Assembly Bill 1515, as modifying the Housing Accountability Act's "reasonable person" standard for determining compliance with land use regulations[29] in favor of

[26] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65921 (West 2023).
[27] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65950 (West 2023).
[28] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65589.5 (West 2023).
[29] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65589.5(f)(4) (West 2023).

approving qualifying development. We read the law consistent with how the First District Court of Appeal read the law.[30] We also interpret the "deemed to comply" provision of the Housing Accountability Act consistent with this same appellate court opinion.[31] We interpret this state law as requiring a city to send a project applicant timely written notice and an explanation of non-compliance if a city determines a proposed housing development is inconsistent with applicable standards.

We use descriptive statistics and interviews to explore whether San Francisco may have imposed conditions that lead to a reduced density (between application and entitlement), or subjective standards (conditions that render the development infeasible), or otherwise effectively denied a proposal to develop housing that a reasonable person would conclude is compliant with land use regulations under the Housing Accountability Act. Where our data indicates that the city may have imposed subjective standards, conditions that reduce density, or conditions that may render developments infeasible, we describe this as a failure to fully implement the Housing Accountability Act. We do *not* conclude whether San Francisco violated an express provision the Housing Accountability Act because of the limitations of our data. We gather and analyze documents that are readily available through the city's parcel information map public portal—but we cannot confirm that the city did not issue a notice of non-compliance with applicable standards *or* did not prepare findings, because the documents are not readily available on the public portal. We cannot interpret the absence of those documents on the city's public portal as meaning that those documents do not exist, ergo, San Francisco did not comply with state law.[32]

We also interpret one goal of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, enacted in October 2019,[33] to be to curb delays associated with hearings, continuances, and meetings.[34] Where we identify entitlements with multiple hearings and more than five hearings, we describe as inconsistent with this law or that the city is not fully implementing the law. We do not determine whether the city is systematically violating the express prohibition on number of hearings, largely because of the data challenges surrounding hearings as discussed in the body of this report.

### Unique Entitlement Dataset

The Comprehensive Assessment of Land Use Entitlements Study (CALES) dataset is a uniquely detailed dataset on how entitlements issued in select years navigated their approval pathway. Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years details observations per study year.

---

[30] We refer here to the opinion in Cal. Renters Legal Advoc. & Educ. Fund v. City of San Mateo, 68 Cal. App. 5th 820, 845 (2021) ("Subdivision (f)(4) is intentionally deferential to housing development.").
[31] *Id.* at 831 (a "project is deemed to comply if 'substantial evidence . . . would allow a reasonable person to conclude' that it does").
[32] We do recommend, however, that San Francisco make those documents publicly available if they exist.
[33] We refer here to the passage of Senate Bill 330, approved by the Governor on October 9, 2019. S.B. 330, 2019-2020 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2019).
[34] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65905.5 (West 2023).

*Table 2: Entitlement Data Counts by Project and Units Across Years*

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019* | 2020 | 2021 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Projects | 24 | 23 | 55 | 38 | 36 | 42 | 25 | 41 |
| Units | 2,470 | 2,069 | 6,371 | 3,359 | 2,824 | 2,807 | 2,839 | 2,869 |

*We included one SB 35 observation without an eligibility determination date in 2019 based on the date of the building permit.

### 2014 - 2017 Observations

The 2014 - 2017 dataset does not include Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approvals but does include litigation-related data.[35] We do not rely on San Francisco's reporting on entitlement and permitting. Rather, we build our dataset from source documents including application documents, planning staff reports, motion and resolution documents, and legal pleadings where relevant, and construct our own code book. Importantly, in addition to our typical quality control measures, San Francisco uniquely provided us an opportunity to review our 2014 - 2017 dataset with the San Francisco Planning Department's Environmental Review team in 2018 following our first working paper.

Using San Francisco's online Property Information Map system (PIM), we augmented the 2014 - 2017 entitlement data in this study by:

1) Collecting additional hearing, correspondence, and approval data on the PPA and Environmental Evaluation Application processes, where available;
2) Collecting in-depth information on the nine observations where parties applied for exceptional Discretionary Review (DR) under San Francisco's Business and Tax Code, including all available data on the requests, hearings, and the Planning Commission's actions;
3) Confirming if and how market-rate developments satisfied San Francisco's inclusionary zoning (IZ) ordinance by reviewing our data and supporting documents (there are 10 market-rate developments in our dataset where we cannot confirm how the projects satisfied the IZ requirement);
4) Supplementing our search for "determined to be complete" dates issued by the Planning Department (there are none for all 140 observations) with a second search through San Francisco's Property Information Map (PIM)[36] for correspondence regarding incomplete applications; and
5) Augmenting existing CEQA-related coding with any available data on Wind, Shadow, and Transportation Demand Management studies for each observation in the 2014 - 2017 dataset.

[35] We detail how we collected and quality checked the 2014 - 2017 entitlement data we reference in the Report to the California Air Resources Board (CARB Report). MOIRA O'NEILL-HUTSON ET AL., EXAMINING ENTITLEMENT IN CALIFORNIA TO INFORM POLICY AND PROCESS: ADVANCING SOCIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS 36-43 (2022).
[36] PIM refers to San Francisco's public portal that provides comprehensive access to numerous records associated with parcels. *San Francisco Property Information Map*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/ (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

The Permit Streamlining Act provides planning departments should determine whether an application to develop housing is complete within 30 days of receipt or the application will be deemed complete.[37] We found no publicly available data that documents that San Francisco's planners made completeness determinations within 30 days of application for any entitlement of five or more units issued in 2014 - 2017. [38]

We explored the data to see if we could determine "deemed complete" dates as well. For discretionary building permit applications, we could almost always locate the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) applications (where applicable) but could not always find Project Applications consistently logged. The Notice of Building Permit Application, however, references the application date (though we cannot confirm the date against a source document). For other approval applications that require only one local approval—like a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA)—we can locate the PPA documents, but we can only sometimes locate applications for those discrete approvals with date stamps of application receipt by the Planning Department.

We also cannot determine from the documents on PIM when planning review began for entitlements issued in 2014 - 2017. For projects that fall under the Permit Streamlining Act, this means that it is not possible to confirm compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act even if the Planning Department staff did not make completeness determinations. For example, we found a few instances of Planning Department correspondence that lists what an application for a discretionary approval (like a CUA) is missing, and states that review has begun and that time limits do not begin until after the project proponent submits the required materials—but the letter does not provide *when* planning review began. These letters are dated many months after the application date.[39] The date of the letter suggests non-compliance with the PSA, but the language is vague. Also, although PIM links users to a portal that provides some building permit data (permit number, description, and date), there is little to no supporting documentation available.

### 2018 - 2021 Observations

We first modified the data collection template to account for important changes in state law and to track source documents closely. We have variables to identify the source of data that we used to determine the timeframe, approval, and hearing values. Adding data source variables allows us to code for whether we were able to identify an approval detail or event based on the original document (primary source) or an entry in San Francisco's portal (secondary or self-reported source). We also constructed new variables to explore:

- How many public hearings (including continuances) to which a project was subjected.
- The approval body required of a developer or property owner before issuing an approval.
- Changes to project characteristics (in terms of the number of units proposed, or types of units proposed) throughout the entitlement process.
- How developments that qualified for state ministerial approvals (such as SB 35) navigated the approval process.

---

[37] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65920 (West 2023).

[38] During our prior research in San Francisco, we did not request this information through a Public Records Act request. We did confirm in meetings with San Francisco personnel that at that time, Planning did not track the relevant information.

[39] For example, using one of our CUA observations to illustrate, we can find the application (with the submission date) and the Planning Department's notice that details what is missing, and that review is underway. The time lag between the two is about 10 months and does provide when planning review began.

Consistent with prior coding, we also always code for “other approvals” we could not anticipate from legal research and review of San Francisco’s local planning and zoning ordinances. In 2018 - 2021 data, examples include approvals like those requiring sidewalk legislation to allow a development to meet other code requirements. We also continuously add variables to augment the dataset to answer the research questions above.

We built our potential observation list to collect data from multiple sources. We referenced Annual Progress Report (APR) data to identify all reported entitlements or ADU or SB 35 approvals that would yield five or more new residential units if built. The APR listed duplicates. We cleaned for duplicates as we only wanted to examine unique projects in the APR. Once we had unique reported entitlements, we ran a match within our own 2014 - 2017 dataset. We ran a fuzzy-join text matching algorithm[40] between unique entitlements in the APR with our 2014 - 2017 dataset. We found six APR unique projects that overlapped with observations in our 2014 - 2017 data (which we had already cleaned and confirmed involved entitlements in those years). We do not include those in our 2018 - 2021 dataset.[41] We incorporated the remainder of APR entitlements into our data collection strategy. We then reviewed CEQA-related approvals in San Francisco's PIM portal and Planning Commission agendas using San Francisco’s public database of environmental review notices of determinations and exemptions.[42] We identified another group of observations (developments that appeared potentially approved in 2018 - 2021) to incorporate into our data collection strategy. Our 2018 - 2021 data includes 16 SB 35 observations and 17 discretionary ADUs. We provide more detail on the accuracy of APR data in Appendix C.

In all, a team of trained students collected data on 196 potential observations of entitlement/approvals issued in 2018 - 2021 after constructing a project list from the APR, cross-referencing environmental review determinations, and any other materials that listed out SB 35 project approvals. After preliminary data collection we determined 144 observations belonged in our study for analysis of entitlements and SB 35 approvals issued in 2018 - 2021. We excluded pending entitlements, entitlements outside of our study years, and Development Agreements associated with a major phased development where no phase or building had yet secured its final entitlement. We completed a full quality check of 133 of our 2018 - 2021 observations. The quality check process involved checking each coded value we recorded in the database twice against the source document or the PIM entry if no source document was available. Where there was an ambiguity or confusion about what the coded value should be, O’Neill reviewed the value and the source material to make a final coding decision.

We completed a partial quality check for 11 observations we gathered late in our data collection process, after referencing amended Annual Progress Reports, to allow for reliable summary statistics, including regression analysis, and all spatial analysis. We exclude these 11 observations from our analysis of frequency of continuances, changes in proposed density from

---

[40] A fuzzy join is a joining method that is used for merging two datasets that are not perfectly matched. The reason we ran a fuzzy join is that there may be differences in how an address was written in the APR and our original dataset. A fuzzy join allows us to match projects that may have similar but not identical addresses in the APR and the CALES dataset.

[41] We would have to first confirm with San Francisco Planning whether these six potential observations were new entitlements and not modifications before including them in our dataset.

[42] *Environmental Review Documents*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

application to approval, project intake processes, inclusionary housing program compliance pathway, and frequency of additional studies during environmental review.

### Primary Source Documents

Whenever possible, we relied on primary source documents; San Francisco does not make all primary source documents readily available. For example, calculating timeframes to entitlement for discretionary observations requires tracking the earliest required application date. Prior to discontinuing the PPA requirement in July 2023, San Francisco required project proponents submit a PPA for specific types of development before submitting a project application. We have 87 observations in our 2018 - 2021 dataset that would have required a PPA application. We were able to locate the signed and dated PPA application document to determine the first application date for 48 of those observations through PIM. We sourced PPA application dates for another six observations from PPA-related correspondence (including the PPA decision document). We had to rely on PIM entries for PPA dates for 22 observations because either the application itself was not dated, or there was no PPA application in the PIM portal. San Francisco's PPA process required project proponents to submit significant information about the proposed development.

Another example relates to San Francisco Planning's policy that mandates a pre-application neighborhood notification process, and a pre-application hearing called the "Pre-Application Community Outreach Process" or "Pre-Application Meeting."[43] This pre-application process requires project proponents to send notices and copies of plans to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations *before* applying to develop land for any new construction or alteration that would change an existing structure by seven vertical feet or 10 horizontal feet. San Francisco Planning compiles the list of neighborhood organizations that project proponents must notify. Though PIM makes most PPAs available, PIM rarely provides source documents that furnish detail about pre-application hearings.

Also relevant, determining compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act requires tracking whether a project proponent applied for entitlement by submitting an application package to the Planning Department. While our dataset contains initial application dates for most of our 2018 - 2021 observations, we can source these dates from primary source documents—signed and dated applications—for only 58 observations. We rely on references to application dates in Plan Check Letters sent by the Planning Department and approval documents in another 29 observations. Where we do not have a primary source document, we rely on PIM entries for application dates, which is data that a San Francisco Planning Department planner entered into the PIM system directly.

In sum, more than half (56%) of the application dates in our dataset are essentially self-reported dates from Planning—and not readily verifiable with application documents. We also highlight here that in at least four instances, the PIM entry reports an application date *after* the approval event (which is available through a primary source document). In another five instances, the PIM system reports an application date that is prior to the PPA date. We assume these are errors (an application should neither follow an entitlement nor predate a preliminary application procedure) but we report out what the data shows, nonetheless. Although these potential errors do not impact descriptive findings on time frames to approval, they do limit analysis of consistency with the PSA.

---

[43] *Pre-Application Meeting*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/pre-application-meeting (July 30, 2023).

### Regression Analysis

We ran several regressions to analyze existing relationships within the CALES dataset. We include all regressions, supplementary analysis, and robustness checks in a separate methods Appendix A, though the main findings are in this report. We ran regression models on 2014 - 2017 data and 2018 - 2021 data separately, and then together. We used the statsmodel Python module[44] to run all regressions in this analysis. We calculated all regression coefficients with robust standard errors (Errors of Order 3 (HC3)) in order to account for the existence of outliers and other issues within the data such as heteroskedasticity (variation in regression errors across our observations) and provide a small sample correction.[45] Note that if we did not use robust standard errors, the standard errors of our estimates would be smaller, so the standard errors and subsequent hypothesis testing are conservative.

### In-Depth Interviews and Meetings and Review of Public Hearings

We have interviews from our prior research across cities from 2017. We used transcripts from six interviews conducted in 2017 with stakeholders within San Francisco (an affordable developer, market-rate developer, city employee who managed affordable development, city planner, land use attorney, and community organization advocate) in this analysis. For this research, we also completed an additional 28 in-depth interviews with 18 additional participants that did not participate in interviews in prior years or in meetings led by HCD between late-fall 2022 and May 2023. We interviewed participants from the following groups: developers (market-rate and non-profit affordable developers); private sector professionals (architects, land use lawyers, planners); government personnel (including city planning staff); and representatives from community-based organizations (including affordable housing advocates). We identified some of these interview participants as experts within San Francisco and reached out to them to participate in an interview. Other participants reached out to us to participate in interviews as well. We advised all participants that the research would be reported to HCD, but we would protect the confidentiality of each participant consistent with our research protocols. For that reason, we do not quote any individual participant and only report on themes based on what multiple participants or entire stakeholder groups shared.

We observed another 33 meetings that HCD convened for their Policy and Practice Review with approximately 146 stakeholders, including city planning personnel, Commissioners, Supervisors, market-rate developers, affordable developers, and housing organizations. Twenty of those meetings invited one participant, and five meetings invited two to three participants. These 25 HCD-led meetings with one to three participants offered in-depth conversations, much like research interviews. Most were an hour, though a few were longer or shorter. Most meetings included participants, one member of the HCD team and O'Neill. A handful of much larger meetings (with more than three participants) included more than two HCD team members

---

[44] Documentation for this module can be found at STATSMODELS, statsmodels.org/stable/index.html (May 5, 2023).

[45] In regression analysis, the errors are defined by the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable (in this case, project timeframes) and values predicted by the regression specification. Accurate estimation of the uncertainty of OLS-predicted values generally depends on constant errors across observations. However, in this study, we do not assume that error is constant (homoscedasticity). For instance, model error might be larger for observations with substantially longer timeframes (i.e., where projects take two to three times longer than the median timeframe). When we use robust standard errors, we no longer assume that errors are constant across all observations, which can mitigate the impacts of this regression analysis being based on observational data. Further, we are using a small sample correction to mitigate the fact that our universe of observations is relatively small and to account for the natural clustering in timeframes that occurs at each local land use approval step.

and O'Neill, along with participants. In each of these meetings, HCD informed the participants that O'Neill would be observing and listening to the conversation for research purposes and that the research would support the state's Policy and Practice Review. About half of the meetings with Commissioners and Supervisors also included a deputy city attorney in the meeting with HCD. Stakeholders discussed planning review and post-entitlement processes in-depth.

In all, we analyzed notes from interviews and meetings with representatives from six different housing advocacy groups, over 20 planning staff and more than 60 development professionals (evenly split between affordable and market-rate development). We also heard from 14 individuals split across the executive and legislative bodies within San Francisco.

Two members of the research team performed a line-by-line reading of a subset (10%) of the interview transcripts and notes from interviews and meetings[46] to identify recurrent concepts to generate a codebook in MaxQDA. We developed codes through an inductive process—a process in which we analyzed the transcript to identify codes based on themes that the speaker emphasizes. We also generated some codes for analysis using a deductive process—a process in which we analyze the notes and transcripts for content which indicates the speaker perceives that San Francisco either violated a state law *or* believes a policy or practice blocks a state law from having its intended effect. Once we had a codebook, three members of the research team coded all transcripts using the same software. We used MaxQDA software to summarize the findings by code and used the summaries to identify cross-cutting themes. This report pulled out findings where the team reached greater than 90% agreement on coded segments. We also generated stakeholder abstracts that summarized dominant themes (including internal consensus and disagreement on key topics within stakeholder groups).

Where interview participants or meeting participants directed us to specific public hearings, we also reviewed those hearings to confirm what participants shared did occur. We only inserted quotes from public hearings or relevant media reporting into this report and did not include any direct quotes from conversations between stakeholders and either HCD or O'Neill.

### Document Analysis

Both interview and meeting participants, along with data collection, identified more than 41 proposed developments for a more detailed review process by our research team. We also located and analyzed documents associated with those 41 potential developments to explore in-depth what occurred during planning review.

### Study and Data Limitations

Regression analysis using CALES data does not establish causal relationships. We rely on qualitative data to establish causality. Interview data is limited by the fact that all study participants volunteered. Relatedly, data from individuals and groups that agreed to participate in meetings with HCD is also limited by the fact that these participants volunteered. Voluntary participation in interviews increases selection bias and limits the generalizability of findings from interviews. We increased the number of interviews to reduce bias, but that does not allow us to generalize about San Francisco's policies or practices. Interview findings, however, can help us craft questions for quantitative analysis. Interview findings can provide important insights when

[46] Some participants asked that the interview/meeting not be recorded for transcription purposes. In those instances, O'Neill took detailed notes during the conversation, and the team joined those notes with transcripts from other interviews or meetings for qualitative analysis.

combined with regression and spatial analysis that regression and spatial analysis alone cannot yield.

The advantage of our 2014 - 2017 entitlement dataset is that it is uniquely detailed. The limitation of that dataset, however, is that our original coding structure aimed for comparative analysis across cities. This means that when we coded our 2014 - 2017 observations, we collapsed some San Francisco processes into single variables to compare processes across jurisdictions. For example, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations were coded together in our master dataset as "exceptions" because that was the most analogous to similar processes in other cities. That limits our ability to explore how those two distinct processes operate when we are studying San Francisco only. To address this in coding for the 2018 - 2021 data, we created two coded datasets. The 2014 - 2017 dataset has less detail than the 2018 - 2021 dataset.

Another important limitation of our entire entitlement and SB 35 approval dataset relates to what each observation represents. Each observation reflects successful entitlements or SB 35 approvals only. That means that this universe of projects that we use for quantitative and spatial analyses represents those developments that successfully navigated the entitlement process in San Francisco. This means that the observations also represent those developments that developers likely had a high enough probability of success that they were willing to pursue entitlement in the first place. We do not have data suitable for quantitative analysis on when and how the city may have denied applications for entitlement in our dataset. That was beyond the current research scope. There is also no reliable data suitable for quantitative or spatial analyses on parcels where a property owner is unwilling to apply for entitlement.

Also, we gathered insights from stakeholders through interviews regarding what occurs during entitlement and what influences whether some buildings get built. Specifically, stakeholders suggest that smaller buildings, which those stakeholders define as 20 units or less, may get entitled but become financially difficult to build post-entitlement. The stakeholders attributed this to an entitlement process that mediates conflicts with opponents in a way that may lead to a final entitlement of a project that is not financially possible to build.[47] If entitlement processes contribute to whether a proposed development is financially feasible—and in turn whether a developer will pull building permits to build—then theoretically we might see a difference in the rate of filing for building permits for buildings that are 20 units or less as compared to larger buildings (21 units or more).

We have two challenges concerning exploring this issue with quantitative methods. The first is that augmenting the entitlement data with post-entitlement permitting data is very difficult; San Francisco's building permit data is not as accessible online or as reliable as entitlement data. Also, San Francisco's local law makes it difficult to systematically identify what counts as the permit that represents the beginning of construction activity and/or intent to build the building because San Francisco has a discretionary building permit process.

[47] Relatedly, at the time of this writing, the San Francisco Chronicle reported on a study concluding that the City's Inclusionary Housing Program is rendering some development fiscally infeasible. *See* Noah Arroyo, *Affordable-Housing Quotas Imperil New S.F. Building Projects, Study Says*, S.F. CHRON. (Jan. 22, 2023), https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-affordable-housing-projects-17727101.php.

# Findings

We report findings in response to each of the questions that HCD asked, drawing on all data and methods to answer each question. Our findings sometimes rely on data from both our 2014 - 2017 and 2018 - 2021 datasets, and sometimes draw exclusively on the 2018 - 2021 dataset. We also compare four years to four years where appropriate and construct year-to-year comparisons or group years by two-year comparisons (e.g., 2014 - 2015 compared with 2018 - 2019) where appropriate.

Table 3 summarizes the total number of observations in our dataset, and the units they would yield if built, both in terms of market-rate units and affordable units. We narrowly define affordable units to refer to deed-restricted below market-rate housing units. Group housing, student housing, and single room occupancy housing are not included in any affordable housing count. Table 4 elaborates on the type of observations within our 2018 - 2021 data only.

*Table 3: Summary of Total Approvals and Unit Counts Across Study Period*

| Study Period | Total Approvals | Total Units | Affordable Units | % Affordable Units/ All Units |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 - 2017 Units from Entitlement of Developments of Five or More Units | 140 | 14,269 | 2,168 | 15% |
| 2018 - 2021 Units Approved from Approval of Developments of Five or More Units | 144 | 11,339 | 3,039 | 27% |

*Table 4: 2018-2021 Approval Observations and Units by Affordability and Process*

| Affordability Category | Project Count | Market-rate Units | Affordable Units |
|---|---|---|---|
| 100% Market-Rate Discretionary Non-ADU[1] | 55 | 4,264 | – |
| 100% Market-Rate Discretionary ADU[2] | 16 | 110 | – |
| Mixed-Income Discretionary Non-ADU | 52 | 3,473 | 873 |
| Mixed-Income Discretionary ADU | 1 | 21 | 3 |
| Mixed-Income SB 35 | 2 | 4 | 1,659 |
| 100% Affordable Discretionary Non-ADU | 4 | 4 | 210 |
| 100% Affordable SB 35 | 14 | 426 | 294 |

[1]This includes 2 Group Housing Projects and 1 Student Housing Project.

Although we elaborate on the contours of specific rules and planning practices when we discuss each finding, there are the two aspects of San Francisco's local law that dominate nearly all interviews and provide critical framing for virtually all of our findings. The first local law is one that makes all housing approvals in San Francisco discretionary. The Municipal Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 26(a) provides that San Francisco's departments may "take into consideration the effects of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents . . . [and to] exercise its [or their] sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked." The city interprets this law as granting the Planning Commission discretionary authority over all building permits, including permits not otherwise discretionary under zoning and planning requirements. The Planning Commission delegates this discretionary authority to the Planning Department to review applications that meet Planning Code standards and Design Guidelines. But when disputes arise over a building permit, "concerned parties may choose to file a [request for exceptional] DR."[48] A DR effectively stops the Planning Department's approval process, sets a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission, and triggers additional planning staff analysis to prepare for the hearing.

Once a party has requested DR, unless they withdraw their request, there is always a public hearing. At the public hearing, the Planning Commission reviews materials and hears testimony and then determines whether it will "approve, disapprove or require modifications to the project."[49] The city states that the Planning Commission exercises this form of discretionary review only in exceptional circumstances when disputes between neighbors cannot be resolved through mediation.[50] The procedure, based on how it is written, indicates that the process of requesting and holding a hearing can add months to the approval timeline, even if the Planning Commission leaves the Planning Department's approval intact.

Another topic that dominated interviews is the ease with which project opponents can challenge discretionary approvals and post-entitlement permits through an administrative appeal under City Charter Section 4.106(b). The city charter provides that the Board of Appeals (an appointed political body) will hear appeals of building permits and demolition permits, unless either permit is issued after the Planning Commission authorizes a Conditional Use.[51] The Board of Supervisors hears appeals of any post-entitlement permit associated with a Conditional Use Authorization and any appeal of a CEQA decision.[52]

## San Francisco's local rules prevent full implementation of the goals and aims of state housing laws.

HCD asked whether the data shows that San Francisco is fully implementing state law, including the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act, Permit Streamlining Act, SB 35, and State Density Bonus Law. The answer, as indicated by the data, is no. Developers, planning professionals, and most housing advocacy organizations perceive local rules as

---

[48] *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[49] *Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[50] The city also elaborates on its interpretation of the power this provision affords the Planning Commission in the Application Packet for Discretionary Review. *See Discretionary Review*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/discretionary-review (Jan. 25, 2023).
[51] The city details the limitations of the Board of Appeal's jurisdiction. *About Us, Board of Appeals*, SF.GOV, https://sf.gov/departments/board-appeals/about (last visited Sept 18, 2023).
[52] Appeal of Certain CEQA Decisions, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., ADMIN. CODE § 31.16 (2013).

blocking the full implementation of the Housing Accountability Act, Housing Crisis Act (SB 330), Permit Streamlining Act, and State Density Bonus Law. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of housing approvals yields findings that are consistent with these stakeholder perceptions. Stakeholders also report that SB 35 effectively expedites planning review, but does not resolve post-entitlement problems within San Francisco.

We report findings related to SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law first, and then move through findings related to steps in the entitlement and post-entitlement process.

## San Francisco Planning fully implemented SB 35, but SB 35 is not a complete process fix.

SB 35 provides a state ministerial process for qualifying urban multifamily code compliant housing developments in jurisdictions that fail to meet their RHNA production targets in prior RHNA cycles. In San Francisco, SB 35 applies to qualifying housing where 50% or more of the units are affordable. A ministerial process is significant for developers and planners in San Francisco because local law renders all approvals discretionary. The state ministerial process eliminates pre-application requirements and hearings (discussed in more detail below), the opportunity for project opponents to request DR, and CEQA review. Once San Francisco Planning determines a project is eligible for SB 35, the developer proceeds directly to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for permitting.

### SB 35 processing timeframes are fast—whereas discretionary building permits typically take years.

SB 35 cabins the eligibility review period to 90 or 180 days depending on the project size (measured by units).[53] Like many other cities, San Francisco "restarts" the review clock if there are any changes to the application.[54] The data shows San Francisco Planning diligently applied this state law. We found that planning review for developments that began as SB 35 applications take about four months but no more than eight months. Table 7 shows that, in contrast, discretionary building permits take approximately two years to entitle or complete planning review before they begin to work with the DBI. Stakeholders explain that entitlement delays increase holding costs, but approval delays may also result in being subject to higher fees, particularly when delays span over years. Timeframes for all non-ADU developments along specific approval pathways spotlight the difficulty of entitlement and the need for a local ministerial process in addition to other zoning and procedural reforms.

[53] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65913.15(c)(1)-(2) (West 2023).
[54] Moira O'Neill & Ivy Wang, *How Can Procedural Reform Support Fair Share Housing Production? Assessing the Effects of California's Senate Bill 35,* 25 CITYSCAPE 143, 143-70 (2023).

*Table 5: Entitlement Timeframe by Approval Pathway 2018-2021*

| Process Categorization | Min. Timeframe | **Median Timeframe** | Max. Timeframe | **Mean Timeframe** | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SB 35 Only (no discretionary process prior) (N=9) | 0.89 | **3.42** | 7.63 | **4.29** | 2.63 |
| SB 35 Conversion (all began as discretionary) (N=7)[2] | 15.39 | **29.39** | 41.39 | **29.18** | 10.32 |
| Discretionary BP (N=17) | 7.76 | **24.20** | 47.70 | **24.07** | 8.58 |
| Discretionary BP with Exceptional DR request (N=4)[3] | 10.32 | **32.33** | 55.56 | **32.64** | 19.76 |
| Variance (by ZA) (N=11) | 19.73 | **36.00** | 69.27 | **41.40** | 19.96 |
| Variance (by ZA) with Exceptional DR (N=5) | 10.39 | **39.48** | 146.69 | **59.28** | 52.30 |
| Variance (by Planning Commission) and Exceptional DR (N=1) | 46.68 | **46.68** | 46.68 | **46.68** | — |
| DPA / LPA / SPA (N=15) | 23.31 | **35.67** | 67.03 | **38.33** | 13.59 |
| CUA Only (N=17) | 18.71 | **35.05** | 59.34 | **35.90** | 12.45 |
| CUA[4] Pplus (N=30) | 17.00 | **39.68** | 105.40 | **46.01** | 21.99 |
| PUD[5] (N=2) | 7.73 | **24.53** | 41.33 | **24.53** | 23.76 |
| Development Agreement (N=4) | 32.09 | **42.16** | 51.52 | **41.98** | 7.94 |
| Map Amendment/General Plan Amendment (N=3) | 34.49 | **42.08** | 64.90 | **47.16** | 15.83 |

[1] We do not include two observations, discretionary building permit projects with additional administrative approvals, in this timeline calculation. One involved a discretionary building permit and an exception, and the other was a discretionary building permit with an ADU.
[2] We have one additional SB 35 project in this category that does not have an eligibility determination date. Though we know it received a building permit, we cannot include it for timeframe calculations. Each of the observations in this category proceeded through a discretionary approval process before initiating an SB 35 application. Some applications pre-date SB 35's enactment.
[3] This includes two discretionary building permits that received requests for exceptional DR and faced administrative appeals.
[4] Includes CUAs with other processes that typically go to the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission but not the Board of Supervisors (such as CUA with a Variance, or CUA with a Certificate of Appropriateness).
[5] PUD refers to Planned Unit Development.

### Developers report that SB 35 transformed planning approval pathways for affordable development.

Developers described SB 35 as eliminating risk because the law creates certainty in entitlement where none existed before. Some planners reported a steep learning curve at the outset; they shared that major changes like this to planning review are difficult to implement at first—and that early state guidance could help planning staff improve implementation. Developers, however, described San Francisco Planning's implementation of SB 35 as efficient and helpful. The data largely confirms that San Francisco Planning made most SB 35 eligibility determinations quickly and within required timeframes. The outliers represent proposals to develop affordable housing using local discretionary processes, sometimes because the project proponent filed the application before SB 35's passage and/or effective date.

Approval data also shows that state ministerial review allowed for faster processing which facilitated the approval of nearly three times the number of 100% affordable developments in 2018 - 2021 as compared to 2014 - 2017. There were only five 100% affordable developments entitled in 2014 - 2017. In 2018 - 2021 alone, San Francisco approved eighteen 100% affordable developments, and 14 of those developments used SB 35's ministerial process. Because of SB 35, most affordable units approved in 2018 - 2021 came through ministerially approved 100% affordable developments that used State Density Bonus Law. In 2014 - 2017, 74% of affordable units came from mixed income developments. In 2018 - 2021, 62% of all affordable units came from 100% affordable developments.

*Figure 3: Distribution of Affordable Units by Development Type*




Graphic Developed by Dori Ganetsos using CALES data.

## SB 35 does not resolve post-entitlement opposition through appeals.

Affordable developers that have used SB 35 describe several post-entitlement difficulties that extend construction timelines. One difficulty affordable developers describe is that San Francisco's local rules allow project opponents to use the administrative appeals process to delay construction by challenging post-entitlement permits. (We discuss other post-entitlement difficulties below.) Construction activity impacts neighbors, who then may file complaints during the construction process.[55] But some neighborhood organizations escalate their opposition to construction by using administrative appeals to the Board of Appeals, which under local law suspends permit approvals until the appeal is resolved.[56]

2550 Irving Street exemplifies how post-entitlement challenges can delay construction of housing approved under SB 35. 2550 Irving, a 100% affordable development that would provide 90 units of supportive housing,[57] has faced at least two post-entitlement appeals of permits.[58] San Francisco Planning determined the development was SB 35 eligible on August 17, 2022. In November 2022, the Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association appealed the demolition permit required to demolish a two-story office building because of concerns about toxins. The filing of the appeal suspended the building permit pending resolution. The Board of Appeals heard the

[55] One notable example relates to 78 Haight Street, which will house transitional-aged youth at risk of homelessness. We found three complaints from neighbors about construction logged in PIM so far. A neighborhood organization complains about inadequate notices about this development online, as well (though it characterizes the housing product incorrectly). *78 Haight*, HAYES VALLEY SAFE, https://www.hvsafe.com/78-haight/ (Mar. 17, 2022).

[56] Wherever PIM recorded an administrative appeal of a permit, we captured that in our database. San Francisco's public portal provides incomplete information about appeals and post-entitlement challenges, so we also asked interview participants to provide examples of projects that faced post-entitlement challenges. We then cross-referenced the DBI permitting system to see if we could find more information on the impact of appeals on permits.

[57] Application data indicates that at one point, this project was proposed to offer 98 units.

[58] San Francisco's public portal reports two appeals associated with the demolition permit for this development, both filed on December 5, 2022 (numbers 22-091 and 22-092). The neighborhood association also filed an appeal of the construction permit.

first appeal of the demolition permit on February 22, 2023, and denied the appeal (with a 3-2 split vote). Online records show that DBI reinstated the building permit, months after the initial approval date of October 28, 2022, on March 7, 2023. The same organization also appealed the construction site permit, originally approved on June 26, 2023. This permit was also suspended pending resolution, and on August 16, 2023, the Board of Appeals voted 2-2 on whether to grant the appeal and whether to continue the hearing. Both the appeal and the motion to continue failed as only four of five Commissioners were present. Ahead of both hearings, HCD sent Letters of Technical Assistance to the City and County of San Francisco's Board of Appeals regarding 2550 Irving, informing San Francisco that under state law, the city should not hear administrative appeals on SB 35 approvals.[59]

In related media, the neighborhood organization stated that they want more environmental remediation before construction.[60] The developer and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development pointed to testing, review, and approval from public health and toxic substances agencies. The Chronicle reported that Supervisor Engardio publicly expressed support for 2550 Irving as "much needed [housing that] should not be delayed" though he also believed agencies could better communicate safety assurances to neighbors.[61] During confidential interviews, however, some stakeholders shared that they do not believe the neighborhood association is primarily concerned about environmental hazards; some stakeholders instead believe that the neighborhood opposes the development because of its size and the development's intended residents.

The agenda for the hearing on August 16, 2023, included a ~1,200-page record for this one appeal. During the hearing, Board of Appeals Commissioners disagreed about the effect of SB 35 on their power to review the permit and the appropriate scope of authority for Commissioners to exercise, generally, when deciding a matter that requires technical expertise. The Commissioner remarks during the hearing illustrate several of the ideological divides within local political bodies that stakeholders described during interviews. The public comments from Commissioners, some of which are quoted below, reveal conflicting perspectives on the normative value of state preemption of local power, the appropriate scope of administrative review of the work product from agency personnel with specific technical expertise, and the purpose and function of the Board of Appeals in general.

> Another point I wanted to make is in regard to SB 35 and SB 35 preemption. As one of the public commenters commented tonight . . . since SB 35 was passed several years ago, 2018-2019, **there has been a proliferation of new state level legislation also taking aim at local review processes**. And most have been drafted by San Francisco's own representatives in Sacramento, and those representatives in Sacramento need to know your opinions on these things **because they're doing their darndest to make sure there is no review process anymore, that the planning commission can't hear these items and they're trying to get it so that the Board of Appeals can't hear these items either, and if you believe in local review as I do as a member of this body, it's your duty and your responsibility to let your representatives**

---

[59] One of the letters is available online. *See* Letter from Shannan West, Hous. Accountability Unit Chief, Cal. Dep't Hous. & Cmty. Dev., to S.F. Bd. of Appeals, City & Cnty of S.F. (Feb. 22, 2022), https://www.hcd.ca.gov/sites/default/files/docs/planning-and-community/HAU/SanFrancisco-LOSTA-022223.pdf.

[60] The Chronicle reports on the challenges. *See, e.g.*, J.K. Dineen, *Judge Rules Contested Sunset District Affordable Housing Project Can Proceed*, S.F. CHRON. (Dec. 9, 2021), https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/judge-rules-contested-sunset-district-affordable-16688685.php (unsuccessful attempt to secure an injunction).

[61] *Id*.

**know what's at stake here and what this means to you** [deep pause] I do think what's going on here goes far beyond the lot lines of 2550 Irving, and I don't necessarily think that even granting this appeal will fix the larger environmental hazards in the Sunset District . . . but I think there is a much bigger picture here in terms of the legal background and what is going on between several different agencies . . . .[62]

I see a distinct difference between that remediation and the permit here that we are here to pass judgment on. . . . We recognize that there is a problem . . . that problem is there is PEC contamination in the Central Sunset particularly around this site, and that needs to be remediated. . . . However, I see a distinct difference between that remediation and the permit we are here to pass judgment upon . . . . The appellant themselves admitted that the construction of this site has no bearing on the issues and levels that will be taking place in the neighborhood. So I see a very bright line between the contamination which needs to be remedied, and the permit that we are here to consider. . . . You know what, this is something that happens to us a lot in different circumstances, usually less dire, usually with a lot less scientific data that we have to parse our way through. When we end up with landlord-tenant issues, we find ourselves with a conflict . . . that needs to be worked out . . . . [I]t is probably best venued in the civil courts . . . but we look not to that issue, but we look to the permit and underlying issues within our jurisdiction . . . . **I see how SB 35 can be very confusing, it can be tedious, it can be difficult, but I have to ask myself do we have grounds under SB 35 to have grounds to appeal this, or overturn this permit, even if we identified it as being material to these issues that were here and I don't think this permit is material to the contamination thing, but even if we did, in this circumstance I don't see a way to get there because the objective standards under the Planning Code . . . are through the Maher ordinance**.[63] DPH has engaged the Maher procedures. They've gone one further for us as a neighborhood association has for them to do and brought in the DTSC because they have more expertise and more resources . . . and so that process that is supposed to take place is ongoing . . . . Let's be clear here, we get nervous sometimes as a board about playing amateur architect. **Right now we're playing scientists and we're playing amateur environmental scientists . . . . [L]et's realize it doesn't have anything to do with the permit in front of us today. I will not move to uphold the appeal**.

I so fundamentally disagree . . . . [P]eople on appeals boards make judgments on experts all the time . . . . And then we had people representing to us that there would be communication, same thing, they made it sound like there was going to be community participation, none occurred . . . . **I think there is an appropriate time to say that the experts got it wrong, or the process was wrong**. . . . I would ask that we continue this [to allow Board of Appeals President to join discussion].[64]

I am not comfortable telling the Sunset residents that they should feel safe, and that is what it really boils down to for me, it is a moral ethical issue for me, and I do and I can take that into account. . . . this body isn't the one that should be hearing this, unfortunately we don't have another body that is more appropriate to hear this . . . . [W]e're attorneys not environmental experts . . . . [T]his shouldn't be litigated in the context of permit appeals . . . . [B]ut we don't have an appropriate forum. . . . [**I]nstead what we have is the Board of Appeals, which for all intents and purposes has become a catch all in many ways and we have taken it upon ourselves in many instances to make consequential decisions and push for consequential**

---

[62] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of Alex Lamberg, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.
[63] Commissioner Eppler is referring here to San Francisco Health Code Article 22A that gives the San Francisco Department of Public Health oversight of characterization and mitigation of hazardous substances in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in the Maher Area identified in the city's Building Code Article 106A.3.2.4.
[64] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of John Trasviña, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.

> **change in city policy in city operations in city administration**. And to me this is the most consequential of any the issues we've dealt with since I've been on the board . . . this one takes the cake. There are people's lives at risk here. **And I don't think we should be the body who is imbued with this power, but ultimately our state legislators have ripped away the other layers of review so it can't go to the Planning Commission. It can't go to other commissions. It's here, and we ultimately have de novo review of this, potentially with SB 35 limitations, but you know . . . ultimately legal advice is just that – it's legal advice and we as Commissioners get to make the say.** I obviously don't think we have the votes to grant the appeal here tonight . . . but you know, if there was a time to make a leap of faith, this was the time.[65]

## More developments relied on State Density Bonus Law as compared with prior years, but stakeholders disagree about how easy it is to use the state law.

State Density Bonus law allows for developers building residential or mixed-use projects with five or more units to build more housing units than zoning would otherwise allow in exchange for a prescribed number of below-market-rate units. The law provides bonuses in the form of additional density and waivers of some local standards. State Density Bonus Law is a state mandate and the state law may preempt local implementation programs with a bias towards "producing the maximum number of total housing units" under § 65915(r) of the Government Code. The law prohibits cities from applying development standards to a density bonus project that would make it impossible to build at the densities or with the concessions or incentives provided in State Density Bonus Law.[66] San Francisco's Planning Code Section 206 implements State Density Bonus Law and provides two local density bonus programs, the HOME-SF program[67] and the 100% Affordable Housing Bonus Program.[68]

We found that nearly all SB 35-approved developments also relied on State Density Bonus Law. State ministerial review through SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law allowed for ministerially approved 100% affordable developments that were, on average, larger (measured in units) than 100% affordable developments requiring discretionary review. The median project size (measured by units) of all SB 35 developments is 121 units. The mean is 119 units. The median project size (measured by units) of all 100% affordable non-ADU discretionary observations is 13 units. The mean is 53 units. For comparative purposes, the median project size (measured by units) of 100% affordable developments entitled in 2014 - 2017 was 134 units, and the mean was 113 units. The median project size (measured by units) of all non-ADU discretionary observations is 24 units and the mean is 799 units. The two largest developments that exceeded 800 units if built—among the outliers—required discretionary approval.

---

[65] *S.F. Bd. of Appeals: Hearing on Appeal No. 23-034* (Aug. 16, 2023) (statement of Alex Lamberg, Comm'r, Bd. of Appeals), emphasis added.
[66] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65915(e)(1) (West 2023).
[67] Housing Opportunities Mean Equity – San Francisco Program (HOME-SF), SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE § 206.3 (2019).
[68] The 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE § 206.4 (2018); *see also Affordable Housing Bonus Program (AHBP)*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/ahbp#:~:text=State%20Density%20Bonus%20Law,-In%201979%2C%20the&text=Ten%20percent%20of%20total%20housing,age%20requirements%20for%20older%20persons (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

*Table 6: Median Project Size by Product Type and Approval Pathway*

| Type | Median Project Size Units | Mean Project Size Units (rounded) | Standard Deviation Project Size Units (rounded) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 100% Market-Rate, Discretionary Non-ADU[1] (N=55) | 9 | 78 | 193 |
| 100% Market-Rate, Discretionary ADU (N=16) | 6 | 7 | 3 |
| Mixed-Income, Discretionary Non-ADU (N=52) | 47 | 84 | 104 |
| Mixed-Income, Discretionary ADU (N=1) | 24 | 24 | — |
| **Mixed-Income, SB 35 (N=2)** | **360** | **360** | **127** |
| 100% Affordable, Discretionary Non-ADU (N=4) | 13 | 53 | 83 |
| **100% Affordable, SB 35 (N=14)** | **121** | **119** | **59** |

[1] This grouping includes two Group Housing Projects and one Student Housing Project.

Thirty-one developments in our 2018 - 2021 dataset used State Density Bonus Law to increase the number of allowable units, and another six developments used the local HOME-SF program (all entitled in 2021). We see a notable increase in projects using density bonus programs in 2021, overall. In total, developments that secured approvals in 2018-2021 relied on density bonus programs more often than the developments entitled in 2014-2017 as well. Only four developments entitled in 2014 - 2017 used any density bonus program.

Also important is that developers used State Density Bonus Law more often than the HOME-SF program. Fifteen SB 35 ministerially approved developments in our 2018 - 2021 dataset all used State Density Bonus Law. The remaining developments that used State Density Bonus Law were discretionary mixed-income developments. At least 13 of the mixed-income developments used State Density Bonus to help meet requirements under the local Inclusionary Housing Program requirements. Five mixed income developments used Home-SF to meet requirements under the local Inclusionary Housing Program requirements as well.

### There was no consensus among developers about how easily developers could use State Density Bonus Law in San Francisco.

Some developers expressed that the waivers both help create an appealing and efficient development and increase the likelihood of entitlement, overall. Some developers shared that the city's local rules and guidelines do not apply state law correctly[69] and/or that the city steered them away from using State Density Bonus Law. Developers also reported that the city applies the law so as to increase inclusionary program fee requirements once development size increases. Planners shared that design review can interfere with application of State Density Bonus Law, as political bodies may request reduced heights or removal of floors to projects that qualify for density bonuses. Affordable developers shared their frustrations concerning how planners have to do substantial work to apply different density bonus programs to help 100% affordable housing developments benefit from SB 35 while also securing required waivers. Planners also commented that State Density Bonus Law is complex, and that they (planners) would really benefit from more state guidance on its application. But planners and affordable developers emphasized that ministerial review and State Density Bonus Law were, together, critical to creating opportunities for more affordable housing within San Francisco.

### Both developers and planners shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to helping developers manage requirements under local rules.

Developers shared that State Density Bonus Law was critical to make development financially feasible. Planners also shared that developers use State Density Bonus Law to facilitate large projects that the Planning Commission might otherwise deny. Planners explained that the city's Large Project Authorization (LPA)—theoretically meant to allow for larger projects and for modifications and waivers—does easily support larger development. Planners perceive that when developers use the modifications and waivers under the LPA, the Planning Commission interprets the project as no longer compliant and covered by the Housing Accountability Act, allowing political bodies to deny approval. Planners report that developers therefore use State Density Bonus Law to make large projects work while also staying covered by the Housing Accountability Act.

One development, outside of our study years, that stakeholders discussed during interviews as illustrative of this issue was **1010 Mission Street**. Planners reported that the developer first sought an LPA for a group housing development which the Planning Commission did not like and denied. The developer then used State Density Bonus Law to get an approval. Cross referencing documents, we found that the developer requested an LPA that was later withdrawn. The developer secured a final entitlement with an Individually Requested State Density Bonus approval and Downtown Project Authorization.

---

[69] Section 206.6 of San Francisco's Planning Code may require revision after the passage of AB 1763, which provides an 80% density bonus, four incentives or concessions, and special parking ratios for 100% affordable housing projects, and AB 2345, which increased the maximum range of the density bonus to 50% for housing projects with 15% very low-income units, 24% lower income units, or 44% moderate income units. *See* CAL. GOV'T CODE §§ 65915(f)(1), (f)(2), (f)(4). AB 2345 also lowers the required percentage of lower income units required to obtain multiple incentives and concessions under § 65915(d)(2). Table 206.6B seems inconsistent with those provisions under state law. San Francisco Planning, however, also issues Bulletins explaining how it applies state law. *See, e.g.,* S.F. PLAN., BULL. NO. 6, IMPLEMENTING THE STATE DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM (Feb. 2023), https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/DB_06_Implementing_State_Density.pdf.

Planners also stated that State Density Bonus law is critical to promoting productive dialogue about how to make proposed developments better, because once it becomes clear that the city cannot deny the project (and only after it is clear the city cannot deny the project), the public discourse shifts towards how to improve the design to be sensitive to neighborhood needs. Participants offered **321 Florida Street**, a mixed-used mixed-income development entitled in 2021 that required an LPA but also used State Density Bonus Law, as an example of a how state law helped secure entitlement rather than a project denial. After it was clear the city could not deny the development, planners also reported that the conversation with the community focused on how to improve the design in a manner that did, in fact, improve the aesthetics of the proposed development. Another example participants provided was **1560 Folsom Street**, another large mixed-use mixed-income development entitled in 2021 that required an LPA but also used State Density Bonus Law. The outcome for 1560 Folsom allowed for special sidewalk placards to celebrate the area's local history.

Planners note, however, that State Density Bonus Law, while critical to increasing certainty of entitlement for larger developments, may not produce more efficient and speedy deliberative processes during entitlement. Consistent with this perception, our data shows that the only approvals under State Density Bonus Law that planning department staff issued were those approvals associated with SB 35 projects. All other requests for density bonuses for discretionary projects required approval from San Francisco's Planning Commission. Relatedly, we found some observations with multiple continuances for hearings for joint LPA and State Density Bonus Law approvals, as well.

Our data also shows that while an LPA coupled with a State Density Bonus Law approval may secure approval from the Planning Commission, the approval is still vulnerable to being overturned by the Board of Supervisors if the community perceives the final entitlement outcome to be contrary to neighborhood needs. **2300 Harrison Street** illustrates this issue. This proposed mixed-use building would have added three stories to an existing three-story commercial building and demolished an adjacent parking lot. The development would add ~27,000 square feet of office and retail space on a site occupied by Lyft, along with 24 units of housing, of which three would be deed-restricted affordable. After the Planning Commission approved the development, community organizations appealed the Community Plan Exception under CEQA to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors unanimously upheld the appeal. A community group publicly stated that the entitled development represented an exploitation of State Density Bonus Law.[70]

[70] Media reported that the new development would result in ~95,000 square feet of retail/commercial space. We reviewed the project proposal documents, and those documents indicate the proposed development would *add* approximately ~27,000 square feet of commercial space, and 24 units of housing, *to an existing* building that had ~68,000 square feet of office space. *See* Laura Waxmann, *S.F. Supervisors Take United Stance Against Mission Development at Former Lyft Offices*, S.F. BUS. TIMES (Aug 19, 2020), https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2020/08/19/sf-supervisors-vote-down-mission-district-office.html.

*Table 7: Frequency of Use of Density Bonus (All Programs)[1]*

| Year (N=Total Approvals/Per Year) | N Density Bonus Used | | N State Density Bonus used |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 (N=24) | 0 | | - |
| 2015 (N=23) | 0 | | - |
| 2016 (N=55) | 1 | | Unknown |
| 2017 (N=38) | 3 | | Unknown |
| 2018 (N=33) | SB 35: 3 | Other: 3 | 5 |
| 2019 (N=34) | SB 35: 3 | Other: 2 | 5 |
| 2020 (N=25) | SB 35: 5 | Other: 2 | 7 |
| 2021 (N=41) | SB 35: 4 | Other: 15 | 16 |

[1]We do not calculate which density bonus programs (state or local) 2014 - 2017 entitlements used.

Stakeholders also do not agree on whether State Density Bonus Law is good for San Francisco. Market-rate developers shared that State Density Bonus Law has been critical to increasing the feasibility of housing development while also satisfying the local inclusionary program as on-site requirements increased over time.[71] Affordable developers heavily relied on State Density Bonus Law to increase the size of 100% affordable development, which did increase the number of units approved. Some Commissioners and Supervisors also described density bonuses as critical to reaching affordable housing targets.

But some Commissioners and Supervisors expressed concern about how the city's application of State Density Bonus Law might derail community outreach or historic preservation. Some planners shared that implementing State Density Bonus Law was difficult at times and required educating political bodies on where San Francisco retained discretion and where it did not under the law (which was further complicated by San Francisco's context of all permitting being discretionary). Planners also perceived that local political bodies did not like the impact of State

[71] Section 415.3 details the thresholds. Qualifying applications initiated before January 12, 2016, had a 14.5% on-site inclusionary requirement; applications initiated after that date had variable thresholds depending on the project size and a complex scheme of alternatives. Under Section 415.6(a)(1), a development larger than 10 units but smaller than 25 that elected on-site units would have to meet a 12% threshold. Section 415.6 (a)(2) and (a)(3) provided that owner occupied developments of 25 units or more would have to meet a 20% threshold, and rentals developments larger than 25 units would have to meet a 18% threshold. Section Section 415.6(a)(5) also provided for incremental increases beginning in 2018, which would raise the thresholds even higher for developments of 10 – 24 units to 15% and larger developments would increase incrementally each year, but not to exceed 26% for owner occupied developments and 24% for rental developments. SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., PLAN. CODE §§ 415.3, 415.6 (2021).

Density Bonus Law on urban form because it limited subjectivity in design review, or its impact on inclusionary outcomes in terms of the overall yield of on-site affordable units.[72] Consistent with these planner perceptions, some Commissioners and Supervisors did express concern about state law that overrides design considerations.

## Local rules complicate application of the Housing Accountability Act.

When discussing the importance of SB 35 and State Density Bonus Law, another important theme emerged. Several stakeholder groups reported that local political bodies do not consistently follow the Housing Accountability Act and deny proposed development covered under state law. Importantly, stakeholders did not describe the Planning Commission as blatantly violating state law but explained that instead, complex local rules make it difficult to determine which local approvals are within the purview of the Housing Accountability Act and which are not. If there is any ambiguity about whether the Housing Accountability Act applies, and a proposed development is at all controversial, that ambiguity leads to a project denial.

Planners emphasized here again the importance of state guidance on how the law changes local processes. When state law does not create a ministerial process (like SB 35) but limits local discretion, state guidance provides clear communication to political bodies and the public how the state law changes local processes. That is critical, planners say, in a local context like San Francisco where at least some within the political bodies and communities interpret local rules as allowing the city to retain the power to deny an approval. If state law significantly limits the right to deny an approval, planners recommend that the state guidance be clear so as to enable staff and Commissioners to say publicly that state law dictates a particular outcome.[73]

## Local rules require entitlement processes begin before the application—and navigate multiple hurdles along the way to approval.

Prior to July 1, 2023, the process for entitlement for many multifamily non-ADU and non-SB 35 developments began with a required Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA).[74] The Mayor's Office recently eliminated this hurdle through an Executive Directive, but we explain how this impacted the observations within our dataset.

Under the PPA process, a project proponent was required to complete the PPA before they could submit their project application. San Francisco's PPA process required project proponents to submit significant information about the proposed development. We have 87 observations in our dataset that would have required a PPA application under that local policy. We can verify PPA application dates against source documents for more than half of those, but otherwise rely

---

[72] Commissioner Diamond on June 1, 2023, expressed concern about the impact of State Density Bonus Law on urban form when questioning whether Supervisor Melgar's proposed legislation to increase density in a west side neighborhood would, in conjunction with State Density Bonus Law, lead to nine-story buildings.

[73] It is important to note, however, that during this research, HCD sent two advisory letters to the city on the impact of SB 35 on post-entitlement administrative appeals, and the limitations that SB 35 placed on San Francisco's ability to hear post-entitlement appeals in the context of an SB 35 approval. San Francisco's Board of Appeals heard both post-entitlement administrative appeals, even though at least one of these letters explicitly stated that SB 35 did not allow for post-entitlement appeals.

[74] San Francisco Planning now provides that it no longer accepts PPAs consistent with the Mayor's Executive Directive issued on February 7, 2023, subsection II.9. OFF. OF THE MAYOR, CITY & CNTY. OF S.F., DIRECTIVE 23-01, HOUSING FOR ALL (Feb. 7, 2023), https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-02/Executive%20Directive%2023-01_Housing%20for%20All.pdf.

on self-reported dates from San Francisco's system. The average time from PPA application to project application was about a year.

*Table 8: PPA to Application Timeframes*

| (months) | **Median** | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|
| PPA to Earliest Application Date | 4.96 | 11.71 | 21.00 |

San Francisco Planning, responding to direction from the Mayor's Office, eliminated the PPA process. Still, San Francisco Planning policy mandates a neighborhood notification process before a project proponent files an application, and a pre-application hearing called the "Pre-Application Community Outreach Process" or "Pre-Application Meeting."[75] This pre-application process requires project proponents to send notices and copies of plans to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations *before* applying to develop land for any new construction or alteration that would change an existing structure by 7 vertical feet or 10 horizontal feet. San Francisco Planning compiles the list of neighborhood organizations that project proponents must notify. However, San Francisco Planning does not consistently track pre-application meetings in its public portal.

Stakeholders have differing perspectives on the value of this pre-application meeting process. Some Commissioners and Supervisors referred to the pre-application process as important community outreach. Other stakeholders perceive it as a requirement that assumes conflict exists before a developer has even proposed a development.

### Application intake processes were inconsistent with the PSA but improved marginally over time.

The Permit Streamlining Act (PSA) requires cities to provide information to applicants about city requirements for applications to develop housing and sets limits on how long a city can take to determine an application is complete and begin planning review. This state law applies to all discretionary development projects that are quasi-adjudicatory actions (like a variance or conditional use requirement). The PSA also limits the amount of time a city can take to process an application, but the clock begins to run after Planning prepares environmental review documents.

We collected information on application dates, and any notices regarding the status of applications and the dates of those notices, when available on PIM, for 135 discretionary, non-ADU entitlements that we believe did not require a legislative act or development agreement for approval. This list includes more observations than we analyze—or it includes observations we collected some data on that we did not include in our timeline analysis because they were not yet entitled, or they were entitled in 2022 or 2023 .

Of these 135 observations, we found notifications sent to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 75 observations(~56%). Of those 75 observations, we were able to determine

[75] *Pre-Application Meeting*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/pre-application-meeting (July 30, 2023).

an application date and notice of status date for 72 observations. Of those 72 observations, 56 notifications (~78%) were outside of the required 30-day period. Of the 56 (out of 72 observations) that are in our dataset for analysis (observations entitled from 2018 - 2021), 41 notifications (~73%) were outside of the required 30-day period.

This does not mean that San Francisco Planning complied with the PSA in the other 60 instances, only that there is insufficient data to determine compliance or non-compliance with the PSA in half the observations.

We also looked at whether San Francisco Planning improved its project intake and notification processes over time. We have a confirmed application date for 130 out of 135 observations. In all five observations where we could not confirm an application date, we could also not confirm a notice of status date. Of these 130 observations, 65 observations have a confirmed application date after 1/1/2018, and 65 observations have a confirmed application date before 1/1/2018.

Of the 65 observations that have a confirmed application date after 1/1/2018, we found San Francisco Planning sent notifications to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 53 observations (~82%). Of these 53 observations, 37 notifications are dated after the required 30-day period (70%). Of the 65 observations that have a confirmed application date before 1/1/2018, we found notifications sent to project proponents about their entitlement's application status (inclusive of notices about the incompleteness of their applications) for 19 observations (~29%). Of these 19 observations, 19 notifications are dated after the required 30-day period (100%). This suggests that San Francisco improved its application intake and notification process, but only marginally. What is also clear is San Francisco Planning is doing a better job to track the data, which can facilitate internal monitoring of this issue and continued improvement.

*Table 9: Analysis of Application Status Notifications*

| | Application Date Before 1/1/2018 (N=65) | Application Date After 1/1/2018 (N= 65) |
|---|---|---|
| Percentage of observations where notice of application status is available | 29% (N=19) | 82% (N=53) |
| Percentage of observations where notice, if available, is outside of the required 30-day period | 100% (N=19) | 70% (N=37) |

## Planning policy relies on exemptions to comply with CEQA, but local rules require additional studies.

State law provides that if a development approval is discretionary, CEQA applies. With a few exceptions, local law determines whether CEQA applies to classes of housing development by making those housing approvals discretionary. State law, however, allows cities to quicken environmental review for some development. There are statutory exemptions in the California Public Resources Code, and the state's CEQA Guidelines provide for another thirty-three categorical exemptions. For example, a planning department can use the Class 32 infill exemption for an urban infill project to bypass CEQA review if the project satisfies certain conditions. The department must still prepare documentation. But the process is comparatively

faster than more intensive environmental review processes, like an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), within most jurisdictions in the state.

When a project is not categorically exempt, the planning agency conducts an initial study to assess whether there is substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. If it is not clear that the impacts can be mitigated below a significance threshold, a planning agency must prepare an EIR. If there is not substantial evidence of a potentially significant effect on the environment, the agency issues a Negative Declaration (ND). If there is substantial evidence that a project will significantly impact the environment, but the developer can properly mitigate the effects, then the agency issues a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

California law also allows the planning agency to reuse existing EIRs to facilitate "streamlining" some classes of development through the environmental review process. This is called "tiering." Tiering allows the proposed development to satisfy CEQA's requirements by relying on existing EIRs, typically programmatic EIRs associated with a plan, and narrowing the environmental review documents to only those issues that have not been evaluated in a prior EIR that covers the proposed project. Tiering requires a prior environmental review document (generally an EIR) typically connected to a prior large-scale planning approval (usually a General Plan or Specific Plan); however, the source of the document varies. A Community Plan Exemption (CPE), for example, is a tiering-based exemption available to projects consistent with a community plan, General Plan, or zoning. When proposed development satisfies environmental review through tiering, it should theoretically reduce project-level costs for the developer because cities generally pay the costs of the relevant plan- or program-level EIR.[76]

EIRs are uncommon in San Francisco. Most developments benefit from streamlining. San Francisco is like its neighbors in this way, though San Francisco's timeframes are quite different from other neighboring jurisdictions we have studied. One notable change between 2014 - 2017 and 2018 - 2021 is that there are more categorical exemptions in the latter four years. That highlights that San Francisco Planning made a change in planning practice that simplifies and lightens the burden of environmental review for qualifying development—and yet overall, entitlements timelines increased in 2018 - 2021.

[76] Robert Olshansky, *The California Environmental Quality Act and Local Planning*, 62 J. AM. PLAN. ASS'N 313, 319–20 (1996).

*Table 10: CEQA Compliance Pathways*

| Year Entitled and N | Categorical Exemption | Tiering (CPE) | Addendum | MND/ND | EIR | Multiple Pathway | CEQA Unknown* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 (N=24) | 4% | 79% | 4% | 0% | 12% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015 (N=23) | 4% | 56% | 4% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 0% |
| 2016 (N=55) | 16% | 67% | 0% | 11% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| 2017 (N=38) | 3% | 82% | 0% | 3% | 11% | 0% | 3% |
| 2018 (N=31) | 29% | 45% | 3% | 13% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| 2019 (N=29) | 48% | 38% | 0% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 3% |
| 2020 (N=18) | 44% | 17% | 6% | 17% | 17% | 0% | 0% |
| 2021 (N=33) | 52% | 33% | 0% | 9% | 6% | 0% | 0% |

Although San Francisco uses exemptions and tiering to comply with CEQA, local rules, not state CEQA guidelines, also require developers complete additional studies. Developers and planners in interviews and meetings indicated that local law demands that planning require wind and shadow studies. We collected information on whether San Francisco Planning required additional studies for 100 discretionary, non-ADU observations. We found no information about wind studies in San Francisco's public portal, which is noteworthy because wind studies came up frequently in interviews. Also, we note here that Class 32 infill exemptions require Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the 44 observations that satisfied CEQA through a Categorical Exemption, 22 (50%) required additional studies.

- ~18% (N=8) of all observations that benefited from a Categorical Exemption (N=44) also required a Shadow study.
- ~43% (N=19) of all observations that benefited from a Categorical Exemption (N=44) required a Transportation Demand Management study.
- ~11% (N=5) of all observations that used a Categorical Exemption (N=44) required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the 33 observations that satisfy CEQA through a Community Plan Exemption, 24 (72%) required additional studies.

- ~32% (N=11) of all observations that used CPE (N=33) also required a Shadow study.
- ~70% (N=23) of observations that used a CPE (N=33) also required a Transportation Demand Management study.

- ~30% (N=10) of all observations that used a CPE (N=33) required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

One observation (out of two) that complied with CEQA through a CEQA Addendum required a Transportation Demand Management study. Neither project required a Shadow Study.

Out of the 12 observations that required a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, 10 (83%) required additional studies.

- ~33% (N=4) of all observations that required a ND or MND (N=12) required a Shadow Study.
- ~67% (N=8) of all observations that required a ND or MND (N=12) required a Transportation Demand Management study.
- ~17% (N=2) of all observations that used an ND/MND (N=12) to satisfy CEQA required both Shadow and Transportation Demand Management studies.

Out of the six observations that required an Environmental Impact Report, 3 (50%) also required a Shadow Study.

## Risk of costly local appeals drives cautious environmental planning practices that limit the impact of the PSA.

In theory, using streamlined environmental review should quicken the planning review process. The PSA sets sixty-day time limits on approving development proposals that qualify for CEQA exemptions and streamlining, once the city makes a determination that the development is exempt from environmental review.[77] But in San Francisco, that is not necessarily true. One possible explanation might be that if environmental determinations always follow other entitlement approvals, using a streamlined environmental review process may have little impact on overall timelines if the other approval steps require more time (though a streamlined process should still reduce costs associated with more intensive environmental planning review).

After reviewing pre-application requirements and notification practices, we explored the data to understand when San Francisco Planning began environmental review and made CEQA determinations. We were able to isolate the environmental review determination or approval date in 95 of our discretionary non-ADU observations. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate what we found: that environmental review determinations almost always happen close to or at the same time as final entitlement decisions under local land use regulation. In 20 of those observations, the environmental determination and approval date is also the latest approval. For the remaining observations in this group, environmental determinations or approvals are often close to the final entitlement date. For 21 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most seven days before the final approval date. For 36 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most 30 days before the final approval date. For 48 (out of 95) observations, the environmental approval date is at most 60 days before the final approval date. This is important because of the limitations on entitlement review timeframes that the PSA imposes but, as noted, the clock begins to run after Planning prepares environmental review documents, not before. Because environmental determinations occur so close to the end of the entitlement period, the PSA seems to have little effect on overall entitlement timeframes.

[77] CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65950 (West 2023).




*Figure 4: CEQA Milestone Timelines Categorical Exemptions Only (2018 - 2021)*




*Figure 5: CEQA Milestone Timelines Multiple Pathways (2018 - 2021)*

Commissioners, planners, and developers all agreed that CEQA slows approvals, and all—including planners and Commissioners—expressed concerns about CEQA abuse. During interviews and meetings with these stakeholders, we asked why environmental review takes as long as it does, as most development in San Francisco is categorically exempt from environmental review or benefits from a streamlined CEQA process. Developers believe San Francisco Planning is too slow to assign environmental planners to projects. Commissioners believe planners are overly cautious because they fear judicial scrutiny. In contrast, planners from multiple departments shared that there are two features of local rules that extend environmental review: (1) local rules requiring further studies add more work, and (2) administrative appeals, or the risk of administrative appeals, to the Board of Supervisors[78] steers planning practice and influences how long review takes overall.

On the second point, planners elaborated that because it is easy to appeal planning approvals, the risk of appeal influences planning practices. For environmental review, both Commissioners and planners perceive that there is a high risk that project opponents will challenge projects by

[78] State law governs much of the requirements for administrative appeals of CEQA determinations (*see* CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21151(c) (West 2023); CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15025(b) (West 2023)) but local rules require that the filing deadline for an administrative appeal of a CEQA determination begins to run only after final entitlement decisions under local land use regulation.

challenging environmental determinations. What is most striking about the difference between Commissioner and planner perspectives is that Commissioners believe planners are worried about judges, but planners expressed confidence that their work would survive judicial scrutiny. Instead, planners expressed concerns regarding the Board of Supervisors.

Planners shared that even if most administrative appeals are withdrawn or denied, the beginning of an appeal creates more work for planning staff members managing environmental review. That additional work changes the pace of all environmental planning reviews for all projects because the projects that face an administrative appeal change review priorities. Also important, the experience of the administrative appeal for planners during the administrative appeal hearing influences their approach to work, overall. The risk of an appeal makes planners more conservative and risk-adverse in their work. One notable trend in interviews and meetings with planners was that planners appeared much more apprehensive of the Board of Supervisors than potential litigants. One planner also stated that, when elected, political bodies are highly critical of planning staff work within a public hearing. This can be demoralizing and impacts the department's working culture.

We reviewed our data across 2014 - 2021 to determine the rate of administrative appeal (inclusive of CEQA-related appeals and other appeals). At least 14% of the approvals in our data (2014 - 2021) faced administrative appeals. We say *at least* 14% because we are not certain that we have located all records on local administrative appeals, as the city does not make past records on administrative appeals readily available online. It is also true that most of the appeals we could locate are denied or withdrawn, and most administrative appeals involve challenges to CEQA determinations as well.

San Francisco Planning's environmental planning division also tracks administrative appeals worked on by their team. This log captures appeals of residential and non-residential entitlements. We reviewed their log of staff hours spent on administrative appeals involving CEQA. Twenty out of 48 administrative appeals filed in 2015 - 2021 that San Francisco Planning tracked overlap with our 2014 - 2021 dataset. Of these 20, the internal department data offers information on cost and time for 19 of our observations. Although the other appeals are not for multi-family housing development, planners shared that these appeals also influence how planners work on housing entitlements. Out of the 20 administrative appeals associated with entitlements in the CALES dataset, San Francisco Planning data indicates that 11 (55%) were denied, five (25%) were withdrawn, only one was upheld, and three were closed with no other details.[79]

San Francisco Planning reports that it logged a total of 5,680.75 hours because of all 48 administrative appeals related to CEQA that they tracked from 2015 - 2021. San Francisco Planning logged a total of 3,031.25 additional staff hours to prepare for CEQA-related administrative appeals associated with entitlements in the CALES database. Translating these hours into days, we find that on average, planners add about 20 days of work per year to their workload to deal with CEQA-related administrative appeals for housing entitlements.

[79] This is consistent with what San Francisco Planning reports for all of the administrative appeals.

*Table 11: Total Time Spent on All CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 N=48*

| (days) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Time Related to Admin. Appealed | 0.56 | 8.69 | 71.06 | 15.11 | 14.92 |

*Table 12: Total Time Spent on CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 for CALES Observations*

| (days) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Time Related to Admin. Appealed | 1.88 | 12.78 | 71.06 | 19.94 | 18.05 |

Administrative appeals add costs to the developer in lost time and higher holding costs, but there are also direct costs to the city associated with the work to prepare for an appeal, even if the appeal is withdrawn. San Francisco Planning reported that all administrative appeals related to CEQA cost the city a total of $793,993 in the years where San Francisco tracked the data (2015-2021). Administrative appeals related to CEQA and associated with entitlements in the CALES dataset (2015-2021) cost the city a total of $421,314. One entitlement in our dataset, 1500-1540 Market Street,[80] required 374 additional staff hours and $52,204 in costs to San Francisco Planning to prepare for the appeal—even though the appeal was withdrawn.

*Table 13: Total Cost CEQA Appeals 2015-2021 (N=48)*

| (USD) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Cost Related to Admin. Appeals | $535 | $10,245 | $81,558 | $16,893 | $16,860 |

*Table 14: Total Cost CEQA Appeals CALES Housing Only (N=19)*

| (USD) | Minimum | **Median** | Max. | **Mean** | **Standard Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Cost Related to Admin. Appeal | $2,167 | $13,741 | $81,558 | $22,174 | $20,501 |

[80] This is a 100% market-rate mixed-use development that satisfied the inclusionary program with an in-lieu fee.

During interviews and meetings, we also learned that San Francisco Planning has undertaken substantial internal work to address at least some part of this problem by consolidating what is presently six steps in the planning review and permitting into three steps. The aim is to bring the process from application through permitting into one department and facilitate one appeal period for project proponents. It is unclear, however, how these proposed operational changes would address post-entitlement appeals, if at all.

## Continuances—possibly meant to avoid later challenges through administrative appeal—are frequent.

According to stakeholders, changes to the proposed development might appear voluntary but result from negotiations outside of hearings facilitated by Planning staff (who are mediating between project proponents and opponents) before a scheduled Planning Commission hearing. The negotiation is meant to facilitate Planning Commission approval, but developers report that what developers end up agreeing to can render a project infeasible. This is another perception that is difficult to verify through government documents, as there would be no written record of negotiations occurring informally before a scheduled hearing. Stakeholders suggested we look for continuances, or a frequency of continuances and multiple hearings, as evidence of this outcome.

We have 93 discretionary, non-ADU observations that required quasi-adjudicative hearings (but not legislative action). All 93 observations have *some* information about hearings, but only about half have complete information about hearings. Still, approximately 22% (N=20) of these observations, inclusive of observations that do not require public hearings under local zoning and planning law, have multiple hearings or continuances associated with a single approval step. One of the entitlements with multiple hearings had multiple hearings related to CEQA approvals. Another two observations were related to density bonus approvals only—one related to the local program and the other to State Density Bonus Law. Nine observations had more than three continuances or hearings for a single approval step. One of these observations (out of nine) is a discretionary building permit project (with no request for exceptional DR), which utilized San Francisco's local density bonus program, HOME-SF, for approval. The two continuances and one hearing for this observation were associated with the approval of the local density bonus program. This building permit project's application date was 3/3/2020, and San Francisco Planning approved it on 5/13/2021. Three observations required five or more hearings for approval. One of these projects had nine continuances for the same approval step. It is also possible that the rate of multiple hearings for a single approval step *might be higher* than what the data currently reveals—as interviews suggest. Our ability to verify these statements against hearing-related data is contingent on San Francisco Planning making the data publicly available.

When we analyze our data overall, we find that the density proposed is greater than density in final approval for 23 observations. Four (out of 23) observations are associated with a continuance. Another two (out of the 23) are associated with an administrative appeal.

## Publicly Initiated Exceptional DR occurs frequently and may foster negotiations outside of public hearings.

San Francisco uniquely allows an interested party to request the Planning Commission exercise exceptional DR, which involves the Planning Commission "effectively taking a second look at the proposed project." This occurs even when the zoning and planning code do not require a

hearing in front of the Planning Commission, but where an interested member of the public states there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that warrant a public hearing.

There was not a consensus across stakeholder groups on the impact of this policy. Most of the city personnel and Planning Commissioners we spoke to through HCD-led meetings expressed perceptions that the ability to request exceptional DR is primarily, if not almost entirely, associated with disputes between neighbors relating to modifications or smaller developments (like single-family dwellings). These groups did not perceive exceptional DR as a dominant obstacle to multifamily development but as helpful to mediating smaller disputes between neighbors, even if it might take too much of the Planning Commission's time. San Francisco Planning shared their log of staff hours to support exceptional DR hearings between 2014 - 2021. Exceptional DR adds fees to all permits to support this process; the department collects between $750,000 - $1 million per year in permitting fees to support staff time for the exceptional DR process.

When we examine data on the staff hours logged to support exceptional DR, we find that between 2014 – 2021, San Francisco Planning had to allocate ~1,872 full days (8 hours per day) or ~7 business years (262 days at 8 hours per day) to additional work to respond to exceptional DR requests. But only about 4% of those hours were spent on exceptional DR requests associated with the multifamily housing entitlements in our dataset. From the perspective of staff who manage that work, the number of work hours dedicated to addressing exceptional DR hearings, generally, may make the same work for multi-family housing seem minimal compared with the work hours spent addressing all other exceptional DR requests. This may influence staff and Commissioner perceptions of whether DR burdens developers proposing multifamily housing.

But we also found that across almost all participants in confidential research interviews (where HCD was not present), regardless of the stakeholder group, exceptional DR was a dominant issue. The only interview participants that did not to bring up DR were those participants that self-described as only having worked with large-scale phased developments. Interview participants raised the topic of DR as a key obstacle to housing production and described the Planning Code Section 311 neighborhood notification process associated with a discretionary building permit, and potential for a request for DR and related hearing, as an opportunity to oppose entitlement on the eve of approval. Stakeholders described this provision as offering an early "appeal" of a planning approval for smaller or mid-size code compliant buildings. These participants also shared that even the request for DR could result in a change to the project that results in something that is no longer financially feasible to build.

Some stakeholders also shared that opposition comes from different types of neighbors; some are interested in the impacts on their own properties, but others use this process to address neighborhood-level concerns. In the latter context, stakeholders share that frequent project-level adjudications are the consequence of inequitable zoning and planning. The DR provision also came up in interviews when parties discussed the suggested reforms laid out in the recent housing element. Some city personnel that expressed support for proposed rezoning, specifically upzoning in more affluent areas, also predicted that upzoning without eliminating DR in certain neighborhoods would result in project opponents effectively using DR to delay housing development. In terms of its use, there are publicly initiated requests for DR for 19% of the discretionary building permits in our 2018 - 2021 data and 21% in the 2014 - 2017 data—for a combined rate of 20% across eight years for building permits only. We also know that the developments that require exceptional DR take comparatively longer to entitle, as well. The frequency with which exceptional DR comes up for code compliant multi-family housing (relative

to other code compliant multifamily housing) might explain why different stakeholder groups have such different perspectives on the same procedural rule, in terms of its influence on entitlement timelines generally.

In our 2018 - 2021 data, 35% of all variances also had hearings for exceptional DR. There were also another two requests for exceptional DR associated with discretionary ADU observations. One of the requests for exceptional DR was withdrawn. The Planning Commission heard the second request and granted DR. There are an additional two requests associated with approvals that already went before the Planning Commission—but the Planning Commission heard both requests for exceptional DR (and denied them).[81]

During interviews, stakeholders reported that once a party requests DR, Planning Staff (to mediate between the project proponent and the party requesting DR) might verbally ask the developer to change the proposed development to incentivize the party requesting DR to withdraw their request. We cannot verify this through the available entitlement data, however.

We explored the data to find instances of requests for DR being associated with developments that change in size (measured by units) over time. We did come across two proposals to develop five or more units through the local ADU ordinance that resulted in tenant requests for DR, though both would later be withdrawn. The first development that would lead to a tenant request for DR involved a request for five ADUs that required a variance. The Zoning Administrator approved a variance for three units, and a later revised approval document states the proposal changed from five to three units. The request for DR occurred after the variance approval, but before the later revision—though there is nothing that indicates there is a relationship between the request for DR and the later revision to the proposed number of units. In the request for DR, the tenants complain that the approved ADUs would interfere with parking both temporarily and permanently. The tenants also detail an ongoing dispute with the project proponent, their failed attempts to initiate mediation, and their failed efforts to delay final permitting.

Another DR request involved a proposal to build nine ADUs, but a building permit was ultimately issued for just six units. This project involved no special discretionary approval step, so it is even more difficult to determine why the proposal changed over time. The DR documents indicate that the organization that requested exceptional DR initiated the request because of concerns about the impact of the ADUs on parking, and the specific impact on a family with a child with a disability. The request for DR was ultimately withdrawn. Again, there is no data that directly links the reduction from nine to six units to the DR request; the DR request only indicates an ongoing dispute with tenants over parking impacts related to an accessibility and disability issue.

## Developers report that design guidelines are vague and invite subjective conditions of approval.

Planners and developers describe design guidelines as highly subjective, allowing for random outcomes, problematic, and wielded as a “weapon.” Many stakeholders report that the design guidelines are not about design; they are about anticipating complaints from neighbors around light, air, “inches or feet” in setbacks, and related features within development that trigger complaints from neighbors, and satisfying neighbors.

[81] One of these observations required a CUA and the other required a zoning map amendment.

Planners shared that although the guidelines are not part of the Planning Code, they are codified in a roundabout way through a cross reference to the Planning Code. For example, Section 311(c)(1) of the Planning Code provides that Residential Design Guidelines shall be used to review plans for all new construction and alterations of existing residential buildings in R Districts. According to the Planning Department, "The Residential Design Guidelines (Guidelines) articulate expectations regarding the character of the built environment and are intended to promote design that will protect neighborhood character, enhancing the attractiveness and quality of life in the City."[82]

Importantly, developments that comply with the Planning Code but do not conform to the Guidelines end up back in deliberative processes, and sometimes back in front of planning staff, even when they have completed planning review and secured entitlement. Planners, developers, and architects note, however, that the subjectivity in the Guidelines makes this an inevitable outcome. Also, in the context of discretionary building permits, the design guidelines raise issues that often lead to requests for exceptional DR as well.

The Guidelines are filled with requirements that on their face allow for subjective interpretation through words like "compatible," "respect," and "character." Examples include, "In areas with a defined visual character, design buildings to be *compatible* with the patterns and architectural features of surrounding buildings." Explanatory text mandates that designers in areas of "mixed visual character" "draw on the *best* features of surrounding buildings" and "design buildings to help define, unify and contribute positively to the existing visual context." *Site Design* guidelines are also often subjective, requiring, for example, that designs "*[r]espect* the topography of the site." Guidelines addressing *Building Scale and Form* intend to ensure design is "*compatible* with that of surrounding buildings." Scale of buildings must be "*compatible*" in terms of height and depth of surrounding buildings, as well as with the "scale at the street" and mid-block open spaces. Building forms, facades, proportions, and rooflines must be "*compatible*" with those of existing buildings.

## Cumulative and unique procedural hurdles create comparatively long entitlement timelines.

We explored our 2014 - 2017 data to run a comparative analysis with neighboring cities where we had similar data. Importantly, our 2014 - 2017 dataset indicates that entitlement timelines were generally *shorter* than in 2018 - 2021. Still, 2014 - 2017 timelines were longer than other jurisdictions. We searched our data to match observations from our 2014 - 2017 data with similar entitlements in Oakland, Berkeley, and Redwood City, looking for the best matches across the following characteristics:

- Same neighborhood characteristics (defined by 2019 Tax Credit Allocation Committee maps; we do not match high resource neighborhoods with low resource neighborhoods);
- Either for sale or for rent (in other words, we do not compare for sale developments to for rent developments);
- Around the same size (plus or minus five units). They need to have the same income characteristics (either all market-rate, all mixed-income, or all 100% affordable developments); and

[82] *Residential Design Guidelines*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/residential-design-guidelines (Mar. 4, 2020).

- Similar local process characteristics (we do not compare a code compliant development that also benefited from a CPE with a non-code compliant development that required a conditional use permit or variance but also benefited from a CPE).

We use these criteria based on several assumptions about neighborhood-level politics across all cities. For example, we assume the political context varies across neighborhood types (in terms of income level). We also assume that neighborhood opposition might vary based on project type (for sale condos versus for rent apartments, and affordable versus market-rate). The last criterion (process steps) is the most difficult for us to match because no two study cities have identical regulatory environments. We therefore looked for equivalencies within local processes based on whether a development required special approvals or not.

We were unable to find matches in Berkeley and Redwood City. We found that the average difference between all San Francisco-Oakland pairs is 1,086 days (~3 years). The difference in timelines appeared related to San Francisco's pre-application requirements and exceptional DR process.

*Table 15: Comparison of Entitlements Requiring CPEs Oakland-San Francisco 2014 - 2017 data*

| Address Jurisdiction | Project Size (units) and Type | 2019 TCAC Classification | Neighborhood (Name) | Affordability | Compliance with IZ (SF) | Required Local Approvals | Timeframe to Entitlement (days) | Difference in Timeframes [83] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1924 Mission San Francisco | 11 units for rent | Low Resource | Mission | Market-Rate (possibly 1 1-bedroom affordable unit)[84] | On-site | Discretionary Code Compliant (Building Permit only) | 1,203 days | – |
| 3253 Ettie St. Oakland[85] | 9 units for rent | Low Resource | Clawson | Market-Rate | N/A | Discretionary Code Compliant (Design Review only) | 348 days | 855 days |
| 7540 Macarthur Oakland | 11 units for rent | Low Resource | Eastmont Hills | Market-Rate | N/A | Discretionary Code Compliant (Design Review only) | 51 days | 1,152 days |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 198 Valencia St. San Francisco | 28 units for rent | Low Resource | SoMa | Market-Rate | Unknown | Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review | 1,302 days | – |
| 3129 Elmwood | 30 units for rent | Low Resource | Jingletown | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 150 days | 1,152 days |

[83] Only populated for Oakland projects. This column shows the many more days it took for the Oakland project to entitle, relative to its matched San Francisco project.
[84] There is an August 2018 One Unit Compliance with Inclusionary Housing Program Affidavit that provides that one of the one-bedroom units would be affordable—but we could not locate a deed restriction in PIM.
[85] It looks like the developer successfully secured excavation, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing building permits post-entitlement in 2018, but those expired in 2019 and 2020.

| Address Jurisdiction | Project Size (units) and Type | 2019 TCAC Classification | Neighborhood (Name) | Affordability | Compliance with IZ (SF) | Required Local Approvals | Timeframe to Entitlement (days) | Difference in Timeframes [83] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oakland | | | | | | | | |
| 956 63rd St. Oakland | 28 units for rent | Low Resource | Paradise Park | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 105 days | 1,197 days |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 645-647 Valencia St, San Francisco | 7 units for rent | Moderate Resource | Mission | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review | 1,435 days | – |
| 4429 Piedmont, Oakland | 9 units for rent | Moderate Resource | Piedmont Avenue | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 137 days | 1,289 days |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 2201 Market San Francisco | 17 units for rent | Low Resource | Mission | Market-Rate | Fee | Variance, Public Initiated Discretionary Review | 1,160 days | – |
| 5325 San Pablo Oakland | 17 units for rent | Low Resource | Gaskill | Market-Rate | N/A | Variance, Design Review | 287 days | 873 days |

## Stakeholders report that San Francisco's policy emphasizes project-level adjudication to achieve equitable development outcomes, when what the city needs to achieve equitable development outcomes is zoning and planning reform.

The comparatively longer timeframes in San Francisco are associated with processes that illustrate a larger, complex, and recurring theme that dominated several interviews with developers, planners, and affordable housing advocates. From the table above, we pull out the entitlement at 1924 Mission to explain what stakeholders report—San Francisco's current policy attempts to resolve neighborhood-level concerns about inequitable land use development through project-level adjudication rather than more equitable planning and zoning.

1924 Mission Street involved a proposal to construct an 11-unit building with ground-floor retail on a site with an auto body shop. The project proponent submitted a required PPA in March 2014.[86] This pre-application process required submitting an application for assessment with the site plan, floor plan, building elevations, and photographs. This PPA process also required

[86] This is a required process applicable (at the time) to all proposed developments of seven or more units. San Francisco has since modified applicability; it is required for developments of 10 or more units, creation or expansion of group housing using 10,000 square feet or more, and unspecified "other complex projects." *Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA)*, S.F. PLAN., https://sfplanning.org/resource/ppa-application (July 11, 2023).

notice to the neighborhood[87] and a pre-application neighborhood meeting. The pre-application neighborhood meeting is supposed to identify neighborhood grievances and prevent requests for exceptional Discretionary Review.[88] Importantly, developers state that these pre-application processes do *not* achieve that end, and this example is consistent with those perceptions.

The Planning Department issued a Certificate of Determination on April 2, 2015, that the project qualified for a CPE (tiering). According to the Notice of Building Permit Application, the project proponent then applied for discretionary building permits on May 23, 2016.[89] The Planning Department issued the Notice of Building Permit Application on March 20, 2017.

A local neighborhood organization applied for the Planning Commission to take exceptional Discretionary Review on April 19, 2017. The application for exceptional Discretionary Review provided that the neighborhood organization requesting review believed the proposed development was inconsistent with the General Plan's policy priority that "[t]hat existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods."[90] The application for Discretionary Review stated that proposed rents would be high, and expressed concern that "gentrification-inducing design, intended to target higher-end tenants, will create local upward price pressure on surrounding tenants."[91]

Importantly, the neighborhood organization expressed concerns that this proposed development was one of several that created harm in the neighborhood. The applicant noted that the harm was related to "the cumulative impact of this and the other seven projects proposed for the immediate vicinity of Mission St."[92] The request for Discretionary Review asked that the Planning Commission consider the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed development and other developments and "demand this project alter its appearance in order that it comes into line with neighboring buildings on the Mission corridor in a way that better helps 'preserve the cultural and economic diversity' of the corridor and the Mission District."[93]

The Planning Commission heard this request on July 6, 2017. The Planning Commission agreed that there were "extraordinary and exceptional circumstances" that warranted Discretionary Review and that "project refinements were necessary to address concerns over the project's compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood." The Planning Commission conditioned the building permit approval on the following grounds: the ground floor retail space needed to be designated for trade shop use, the project proponent needed to explore providing a mural on one wall, and the project proponent needed to "work with Planning Department staff on refin[ing] the exterior design to provide a stronger relationship to the surrounding context." The Building Department issued a demolition permit to demolish the auto body shop in August

---

[87] The notice requirements for the Pre-Application Meeting demanded notification to all property owners within a 300 feet radius, all relevant neighborhood organizations, and anyone who requested notice. Meetings may only be held during certain hours, and project proponents must keep a record of all attendees.
[88] The first page of the Pre-Application Meeting Packet logged in PIM provides: "The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed."
[89] There is no Project Application logged in PIM.
[90] This language comes from the Application for Discretionary Review, page 4, logged in PIM.
[91] Id.
[92] Id.
[93] Id.

2019 and a temporary shoring permit for an empty lot in 2021. DBI's Permit Tracking system seems to indicate review of plans through spring of 2021, but no activity is logged after that.[94] It is also unclear how the final project-specific conditions of approval resolve the larger, neighborhood level concerns about gentrification and displacement raised during this request for exceptional Discretionary Review—which are at least in part related to the city's zoning and planning that dictates where developers may build multi-family housing citywide.

## Planners and developers believe San Francisco needs procedural reform that addresses discretionary review, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors agree.

Stakeholders explained that three features of San Francisco's local law invite project-by-project adversarial politics that will prevent San Francisco from meeting housing production targets and equitable housing outcomes: (1) density and use controls that limit development to specific neighborhoods, (2) procedural law and policy that renders all approvals discretionary, and (3) charter provisions that allow project opponents to appeal multiple post-entitlement construction permits.

When discussing SB 35, affordable developers and planners explained the state ministerial process resolved the second issue without touching the first or third. SB 35 may fix planning review for eligible projects, but it cannot fix San Francisco's housing production pipeline because two major impediments to production remain. (SB 35 also only applies because San Francisco has failed to meet its RHNA targets—which is not the city's aim.)

According to planners, developers, and many housing advocates, achieving production targets, affordability, and equity demand long-range planning, rezoning for density in higher opportunity areas in conjunction with a *local* ministerial approval process, and charter reform to limit post-entitlement appeals. Some planners shared that a local ministerial process would have more legitimacy with community members than a state ministerial process; legitimacy that planners perceive as important within San Francisco because of the city's poor track record in prior decades of engaging with certain neighborhoods and low-income communities. But many stakeholders, including planners, shared their belief that current and proposed local procedural reforms, including the Mayor's Housing for All Executive Directive, are insufficient to remove policy constraints on production. According to these stakeholders, current reforms merely "tinker" with the planning code while leaving blanket discretionary review and the administrative appeal process intact. Stakeholders who shared this perspective stated plainly that they think the Mayor's Office can only do so much to fix these issues—the real fix depends on the Board of Supervisors and possibly the electorate. There were a handful of stakeholders who emphasized that the Mayor's Office must lead in addressing problems with permitting and felt entitlement processes were not the problem.

Every stakeholder that shared that San Francisco needs a local ministerial process and charter reform also felt accomplishing either one is politically impossible. Several planners expressed a belief in the need for state intervention—but not necessarily a preference for state intervention. Interview participants across several stakeholder groups emphasized that local processes that require the most reform are intertwined with values and assumptions about what these

[94] It is difficult to ascertain much more than the status of a permit from building permit data.

procedural rules offer in terms of stakeholder engagement, historic and cultural preservation, and ultimately, spatial equity.

Several planners also explained that San Francisco has inadequately engaged community around planning and zoning for decades. There was a consensus among planners that recent efforts by Supervisors to connect with low-income communities around land use still lack sufficient and intentional community engagement. Planners also described a need for the city to mend relationships with community through acknowledgment of and documentation of past harms. Some affordable developers echoed these concepts when they described how some neighborhoods continue to have the city's legacy of racism codified in neighborhood association covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&R).

Planning staff and some housing advocates explained that it is not in the city's best interests to keep existing processes as they are if the city's goal is to redress these past harms and increase housing production in an equitable way. But because process requirements are framed as key to stakeholder engagement and participation, planners believe no local political body wants to dismantle them. Process in San Francisco is sacrosanct. Consistent with this perspective from planners, some Commissioners emphasized the importance of engagement, but Commissioners focused on engagement during the project entitlement phase. The difference in how stakeholder groups described the need for community engagement in relationship to planning, zoning, and project development is significant. Planners discussed a need for engagement at larger scales and at the legislative level, to facilitate equitable planning and zoning, not just at the project-level. Commissioners focused on engagement at the project-level.

Interview participants also elaborated and described existing density and use controls and project-level adjudication as reflecting how power over land use is inequitably distributed citywide. Certain neighborhoods wield enough power over political bodies to block changing density and use controls, so no multifamily housing is proposed in the first instance. These constituents who benefit most from the spatial distribution of density and use controls do not need to attend public hearings to block housing development. Developers propose dense multifamily housing (and affordable housing) where housing may be built under zoning and planning standards.[95] That leaves communities in the neighborhoods where zoning allows housing to be built with one primary pathway to access power over land use; they must go through project-level adjudication, or public hearings. Some neighborhoods have built up power over time and can now effectively block all development through project-level adjudication. Other neighborhoods have more recently begun advocating for community needs through project adjudication. Planners also described alliances between wealthy residents and community activists with less money and influence that are working to protect their communities from harm from what they perceive to be the "greedy developer."

Stakeholders explained that project-level adversarial politics may seem responsive to inequitable land use patterns because it allows communities to advocate for what they need, but

[95] These perspectives were consistent with what we discovered in earlier research on San Francisco's zoning, reviewing zoning neighborhood planning between 1921 (beginning with the 1921 San Francisco Building Zone Ordinance, and reviewing 1948, 1979 and 1990 zoning) through the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan adopted in 2009. We found that the entitlements for 5 or more units issued in 2014 - 2017 were concentrated almost entirely in neighborhoods that had zoning for multi-family housing in place since at least 1921 (the Mission) or in neighborhoods that may have been zoned industrial neighborhoods but later rezoned for mixed-use (such as SoMa and Potrero Hill).

this approach fails to change power imbalances or solve for structural inequities. Neighborhoods that have prevented density (through zoning and planning standards) remain unavailable for development. Other neighborhoods feel perpetually burdened. When project opponents from vulnerable neighborhoods cannot stop an approval, they also interpret the entitlement as signaling that political bodies do not care about their neighborhood's needs[96] even though planners state that the opposite is true. Planners believe that the Planning Commission cares very deeply about neighborhood needs. From the perspective of planners, it is because the Commissioners care deeply about neighborhood needs that they slow or block housing approvals.

Planners shared local rules do too little to facilitate meaningful public input into design because the local rules without state intervention lead to just one conversation about how the city may deny the proposed development. Planners perceive that soliciting meaningful community input into design does not happen until political bodies and neighbors accept a project approval is imminent. Only then, according to planners, does the entitlement process facilitate community input to make the design better and prevent unintended harm the neighborhood. But planners report that at present productive dialogue to allow for community input depends entirely on state law that intervenes in local discretion in some way, and that the current local regulatory framework provides an inefficient and slow means to achieve housing production sensitive to neighborhood needs.

Participants in confidential research interviews cautioned that proposals to rezone need to be coupled with local ministerial processes or the rezoning will leave the existing inequities in place. Planners predict that any rezoned neighborhoods that have not welcomed dense housing in the past will use San Francisco's procedural law to block development if rezoning is not coupled with a ministerial approval process. Affordable developers share this perspective. Also, planners believe a local ministerial process would require all parties to pay more attention to the requirements of the code, which would better achieve more predictable and desired housing outcomes. Many planners and housing advocates said that disrupting this structural imbalance of power requires the kind of procedural overhaul that challenges entrenched beliefs about what current discretionary processes offer, which these stakeholders believe makes local procedural reform politically impossible. Planners believe the ideological divide within political bodies limits legislative proposals; planners believe Supervisors are limited to developing legislation that Supervisors believe will get passed,[97] which may or may not result in effective reform. Nonetheless, there was an unequivocal consensus among planners and affordable developers that San Francisco needs major procedural reform because not all neighborhoods welcome affordable housing development.

Although within stakeholder groups there was agreement on these topics, there was no consensus across stakeholder groups on any of these points. Planners and developers (including affordable developers) agree that San Francisco needs substantial local process reform that removes some discretion, but not all Commissioners and Supervisors share this perspective. During meetings with HCD, some Commissioners and Supervisors' perceptions clearly aligned with planners and developers on the relationship between zoning, procedural rules, and substantive standards on development and inequities across neighborhoods. These

[96] During interviews, one development noted as illustrative was 792 Capp Street, which required a Conditional Use Authorization to demolish a single-family dwelling to build four units; the CUA hearing was continued seven times before entitlement.

[97] Supervisor Melgar's public statements during the hearing on June 1, 2023, where she states her recommendations are to help ensure that the Housing Element gets passed, reflect a similar perspective.

participants acknowledged the challenges with existing discretionary review and administrative appeals of post-entitlement permits, and articulated these rules as potential constraints on supply and affordability. These Commissioners and Supervisors explained the difficult tradeoffs political bodies grapple with when developing or amending procedural rules, but they did acknowledge a need for legal reform.

Other Commissioners and Supervisors, however, expressed entirely different perceptions. Some Commissioners and Supervisors emphasized the importance of maintaining discretionary review while proposing that reforms should promote faster, more predictable processes. Some Supervisors characterized San Francisco's political bodies as consistently inclined to approve most proposals for housing and stated that all neighborhoods welcome affordable housing (though they did not distinguish between neighborhood groups responding to proposals to build affordable housing and their own voting records on affordable housing). The perspectives of some Supervisors on the topic of affordable housing sharply contrasted with what both affordable developers and planners shared. Affordable developers stated that many San Francisco neighborhoods do not welcome affordable development and residents are concerned about more units or taller buildings, generally. Affordable developers also perceived the west side of the city as particularly unwelcoming of affordable development.

Some Supervisors also shared their skepticism about the need for market-rate housing supply to address the city's housing issues, and their belief that inadequate funding for subsidized housing was the primary obstacle to addressing the city's housing needs.[98] While affordable developers and planners agreed that more state funding is critical for San Francisco to develop needed affordable housing, affordable developers and planners also called out local policy obstacles to production (including post-entitlement problems). In sum, affordable developers see funding and regulatory reform as both essential to increasing affordable development, whereas some Supervisors critique the latter as an approach to solving the city's housing challenges.

Some Commissioners and Supervisors also expressed deep concerns about state law that they interpreted as punitive, or harmful to local implementation of important aesthetic controls and historic preservation. What also really stood out was the difference between affordable developer and planner perspectives and those of some members of political bodies on the role of state law in accelerating affordable development.

## All stakeholder groups report persistent post-entitlement challenges.

During interviews and meetings, *all* stakeholders, ranging from developers, architects, lawyers, and planners, complained of persistent challenges post-entitlement. Some of the dominant concerns related to the lack of uniformity in post-entitlement permitting. These stakeholders perceive that permitting depends on who is assigned to the process rather than on the form or

[98] In the November 15, 2022 hearing on the draft Housing Element, Supervisor Preston, for example, repeatedly stated that the aim of state law is to avoid providing more funding and to instead deregulate market-rate housing as the pathway to increase affordable development. *See S.F. Bd. of Supervisors: Hearing on the Draft Housing Element 2022* (Nov. 15, 2022) (statement of Dean Preston, Supervisor). Supervisor Preston shared these same perspectives in an open letter online, as well. Letter from Dean Preston, Supervisor, S.F. Bd. of Supervisors, to Gustavo Velasquez, Director, Cal. Dep't Hous. & Cmty. Dev. (Aug. 11, 2022), https://56a418ca-94d2-476c-9a45-f491ca4a0387.usrfiles.com/ugd/56a418_6abc98cb39f3429b85a1e3f2fb69fa17.pdf.

requirements of the development. Developers also commented that the system of review, itself, incentivizes extending review timelines. There is also no mechanism to escalate projects to someone with a higher position or a deeper understanding of what the projects require. The fact that there is priority review for affordable development is also negated by the fact that other developers can pay for priority review, so there is no true prioritization in the review process. Developers also shared that the subjectivity in the post-entitlement process can trigger a second stage of planning review even after the development has proceeded to the Department of Building Inspections.

Affordable developers were emphatic that state law, like SB 35, does nothing for post-entitlement challenges. All developers grapple with inadequate interagency coordination during the post-entitlement phase of development that creates duplicative review processes, delays, and inefficiencies. Interviews and meetings also suggest that affordable development may be most impacted. Developers attribute these problems to city departments lacking a production focus, and that no single person or department is sufficiently empowered to monitor the process. One stakeholder described post-entitlement as a “kickball game” with developers going back and forth between departments and personnel. Planners also described problems with permitting processes as at least in part due to a poorly structured operation that lacks adequate policy and transparency, so staff are unaccountable in the way that planning staff are held accountable. Developers shared similar perceptions. Stakeholders describe the lack of an intermediate administrator between DBI and the Building Inspection Commission (an administrator within the city’s executive branch) as a deficiency that contributes to inadequate coordination within and between departments.

Affordable developers shared significant difficulties with utilities processes for affordable development that led to extended periods of no power during and after construction. One developer characterized the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) power requirements as “crippling” for affordable housing development. All developers expressed frustration with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), generally, with some developers describing PG&E as monopolistic and engaged in “political retribution” with SFPUC by imposing infrastructure improvements or deprioritizing projects that go through the SFPUC. Affordable developers also report challenges with poor inter-agency coordination around meeting accessibility requirements, trouble with satisfying public art requirements, and difficulty meeting local hiring requirements because of labor shortages.

Nearly all participants offered their concerns about current efforts to address challenges with DBI and permitting. One frequent comment was that any directive to improve permitting processes (for example, by shortening permitting timelines) depends on having a baseline to make improvements from, but there is no baseline because there is poor data on permitting and no one has managed to track that information.

# Conclusion

We entered this research understanding that San Francisco’s entitlement timeframes were much longer than other jurisdictions. (The state’s Annual Progress Report Data Dashboard would later show that San Francisco self-reported the longest entitlement timeframes across the state.) What remained unclear was *why* retaining discretion over all development creates comparatively longer timeframes in San Francisco. Neighboring jurisdictions in the Bay Area also used discretionary review to approve all multifamily housing as well, but they did not take as long. Oakland, for example, retained discretion over all development of five or more units and

the median timeframe to approval was six months. Redwood City applied discretionary review to similar housing development and required *more* approval steps and the timelines were still shorter. Even entitlement in the City of Berkeley, which requires a use permit for any development, did not take as long as San Francisco. These are findings we could not explain because we did not dive into the details of how different discretionary pathways influenced approval outcomes or timeframes for specific types of multi-family housing.

Our earlier data also made it clear that San Francisco Planning prioritized 100% affordable developments—yet it was also true that affordable development did not move quickly, and the local regulatory environment was not hospitable to affordable housing despite staff efforts to quicken approvals for affordable development. In fact, our interviews from prior years signaled that even as San Francisco Planning prioritized 100% affordable development, local regulation, and local application of environmental review created risk that some affordable developers simply could not manage. Consistent with what interview and meeting participants shared, the 2014 - 2017 housing approvals data revealed there were only five 100% affordable developments entitled in those four years. Nearly three out of every four affordable housing units entitled in 2014 - 2017 depended on mixed-income development, or application of the city's inclusionary program to market-rate housing. It is important to note that before SB 35, increasing affordable housing production depended almost entirely on market-rate developers.

The data we have now, however, offers more insight into what parts of San Francisco's system generate comparatively longer timeframes and why. San Francisco, like so many other cities we have studied, continues to grapple with the consequences of inequitable land use policy from earlier decades. One of the primary tools San Francisco uses to redress past wrongs is process. Thus, like many other cities, San Francisco local law creates a procedural maze for housing entitlement through both zoning and aesthetic regulation. But what the data above tells us is that in San Francisco, the procedural maze is one with walls that move. Provisions within the Business and Tax Code and the city's Charter allow project opponents to repeatedly challenge approvals during and after planning review, and in some instances, impose new conditions of approval. No proposed housing development is immune under local law. This fosters a system of lengthy and repeated negotiations throughout and beyond entitlement.

The state asked whether San Francisco was fully implementing state housing law, and the data indicates that for the most part, the answer is no. This is true despite the diligent work of city personnel to facilitate housing approvals. What came through as a dominant theme in most interviews and meetings with developers was high regard for planning personnel combined with a heightened level of frustration with planning department processes. It was also clear that several Commissioners and Supervisors want to see more housing production, as well.

What exactly about local law blocks full implementation of state law that aims to simplify and quicken process? Stakeholders explained that the same rules which allow for repeated challenge to approvals, including post-entitlement approvals, are what invite subjective conditions of approval and constant negotiation outside of public hearings during the entitlement process. They also report that the risk of administrative appeal to local political bodies drives all planning practice, not just environmental planning practices—although environmental planning is particularly burdened. Though we found that most administrative appeals are withdrawn or denied, we heard that the beginning of an appeal creates more work for planning staff, which in turn changes the pace of all environmental planning review for all projects. All environmental determinations under CEQA occur near the end of the entitlement process (right before or at final entitlement). This practice seems to eviscerate the effects of PSA on timely approvals. If left as is, existing blanket discretionary review and planning practices will likely diminish the

effects of SB 330 as well, which targets excessive continuances and hearings, going forward. That suggests that addressing this problem requires scrutinizing both existing planning practice and the local administrative appeal process. According to most stakeholders we consulted, although many parts of San Francisco's local law need reform, the efficacy of any reform hinges on whether the city can revise its Business and Tax Code and Charter.

San Francisco's application of SB 35 yields the most insight into what legal reforms will likely expedite planning review. SB 35 changed San Francisco's application and intake process for qualifying development. Although the 2018 - 2021 data indicates that San Francisco's application intake process under local law was inconsistent with the PSA, the city regularly complied with SB 35's time constraints on planning review. When discussing what is needed to improve the housing approval pipeline in general, participants in confidential interviews shared that San Francisco needs a local ministerial process that parallels SB 35, to eliminate blanket discretionary review of all permits, thoughtful reform of local administrative appeal processes, and equitable rezoning in low density affluent areas. But no interview participant was optimistic that San Francisco could deliver on these reforms without state intervention in local power.

Also important—there was consensus among several stakeholder groups that communities within San Francisco have been harmed by the city's planning and zoning in the past, but no consensus on how the city should proceed going into the future. There was also no consensus between stakeholder groups, particularly between city staff and city officials, on what housing production would best serve the city's housing needs, on the role of local regulation in enabling or blocking housing production, the role of state law on facilitating housing production, and what the city should do to meet housing need *and* achieve spatial equity.

For example, planners and city personnel discussed the city's RHNA obligations when defining the city's housing problems. Planners described San Francisco land use policy with a wide lens, pulling in developer perspectives, neighborhood needs, and politics when discussing the effects of current policy and planning practice on production outcomes. Also notable, most city staff described how reforms could advance participation goals or spatial justice, but they also described individual policies and planning practices as pieces within a larger system that accounted for law, policy, and cyclical market conditions. Planners and city personnel offered detailed analysis of what is not working that was easy to verify using other data. City staff were clear that local legal reform would be the best solution, but also were not hostile to state laws that addressed some of San Francisco's procedural challenges.

Discussions with members of the political bodies responsible for developing and enacting the local legal reform were very different. All Commissioners and Supervisors agreed that the housing approval process was slow and needed improvement. One Supervisor even went so far as to describe San Francisco's entitlement process as difficult by design. Some Commissioners and Supervisors were also as pragmatic as staff offered robust explanations of how local regulation operates across the city, distinguishing between law and practice and explaining how politics influence planning practice and production outcomes. A few foregrounded specific and precise local legal reforms to support housing production citywide with sensitivity to equity and spatial justice within the city's existing policy framework and current market conditions. Some were deferential to planning staff as experts on what is needed in terms of procedural reform. Some were explicit in their support of program statements in the housing element that call for ministerial processes for at least some development.

But some political participants responded to questions about how policy and planning work within San Francisco with answers focused almost entirely on contributing factors to production

that were outside of the city's purview—like state funding for affordable housing. Some Commissioners focused most on how to improve implementation of the existing rules while retaining discretion in all planning review. There was also a split in how the Commissioners and Supervisors perceived state law, and the housing element process, as well. Some were explicit that they felt the state was penalizing San Francisco through the RHNA process, and that regulatory and practice reform would not resolve the challenges San Francisco is facing.

Thus, what the data also shows is that the primary gatekeepers to local policy reform do not agree with each other or city staff on the scope of San Francisco's housing need or on what the city must to do to meet that need. There is also no agreement on the relative importance of local regulation in creating, perpetuating, or ameliorating the city's housing problems.

## Appendix A: Regression Supplement With Methods

In earlier writing, we found that longer timeframes within a city were not necessarily associated with more approval steps on average. But our analysis compared median timeframes and average local steps to entitlement in one city to another city. We did not explore the potential relationship between timeframes and local steps to entitlement in any single case study city. This analysis, within San Francisco only, is important because at least some procedural reform proposals assume that reducing steps to approval while maintaining discretionary review will shorten timeframes. At the same time, stakeholders describe San Francisco's regulations as creating variability and uncertainty in the approval process, even when a proposed development has few steps to approval.

Generally, within a single city, even if entitlement takes a long time overall, we expect that more approval steps extend timeframes. Theoretically, if a development conforms to existing planning and zoning and requires no local-level approvals, it should take less time than a development that requires one or more special approvals to secure entitlement. San Francisco's local law does provide for dense residential buildings in some neighborhoods, without any special approvals. San Francisco's law also allows dense residential housing in other neighborhoods but with required special approvals. For example, development over a specific height threshold in some areas requires a Conditional Use Authorization or Large Project Authorization. If the local law is operating as we think it should, planning review might take longer when a development requires a Conditional Use Authorization before a building permit than if the development requires only a building permit. Finally, when a property owner proposes development that requires a rezoning or General Plan Amendment, it might take even longer than a project requiring a Conditional Use Authorization because what the developer is proposing is not provided for in existing planning and zoning.

But what we have heard within interviews so far is that this is not how local planning and zoning operates in practice. Most stakeholders described a process where neighbors may oppose any proposed development in any context, and planners are placed in a position of mediating disputes. Because of this, the time to entitlement (and certainty of approval) is unpredictable for all development subject to discretionary review, whether a project conforms to the local planning and zoning or not.

Stakeholders describe informal and formal pre-application processes for initial outreach and meetings to help planners, and the property owners anticipate neighborhood reaction and adjust a proposed development before proceeding through the entitlement application process. They also described a process where planners worked to mediate and resolve potential conflicts before proposals went in front of approval bodies (like the Planning Commission).

But stakeholders also note that although a property owner may begin negotiations with neighbors before the application (and in cases where the Planning Department requires a Preliminary Project Assessment, sometimes before that process), and continue negotiations throughout planning review, project opposition may not manifest until late in the process. They emphasized that smaller buildings are most vulnerable. Therefore, no matter what work the planners and property owners put into anticipating and mediating disputes over proposed projects, the process allows the risk of opposition for new, sometimes unpredictable, reasons to remain. Because opposition can emerge at any time, stakeholders say this makes the timeframes and approval outcomes uncertain.

These statements suggest that we should explore the entitlement data to see if entitlement for code compliant development is associated with shorter timeframes as compared with entitlement that requires special approvals or deviates from planning and zoning. Theoretically, code-consistent development should always move faster. One way we do this is to explore relationships between local steps to entitlement and timeframe to entitlement. If longer timeframes are associated with more approval steps, then policy proposals that focus on eliminating or consolidating approval process steps to expedite housing approvals should help shorten timeframes. But if more approval steps are not associated with longer timeframes, this means that something else is occurring to lengthen timeframes. If that is true, reducing the number of discretionary approval steps, alone, may not resolve the uncertainty and unpredictability stakeholders describe. **Although analyzing our entitlement dataset using regression cannot "prove" or "disprove" what stakeholders have shared, this additional analysis allows us to use more than one method and multiple data points for insights, which is more reliable than relying on only one method or data point.**

We chose to run linear regression models, rather than probability models, because we are interested in understanding what drives project timeframes in San Francisco—not necessarily what drives extreme delays within the context of San Francisco's regulatory environment. If we used a probability model, we would need to generate a binary variable as the dependent variable in our analysis. This variable would distinguish observations that are delayed (in terms of the project timeframe). San Francisco's extraordinarily long entitlement timeframes make this very difficult. For example, generating a binary cutoff for delayed timeframes at the median would lead to a cutoff of 39 months. That means we would be defining observations with incredibly long timeframes as "not delayed" because they were below this median, and then using the probability model to see whether certain factors generate delays beyond 39 months. Since most discretionary projects in San Francisco are delayed, even if they are delayed for less than 39 months, a probability model with a binary dependent variable is not best suited for our analysis. Also, that model would ignore project factors that are associated with two- or three-year timeframes because it would classify these projects as "not delayed."

## Regression Analysis Using 2018 – 2021 Data (OLS Models)

We first analyze the existing associations between local land use approvals[99] required for entitlement in 2018 - 2021 and project timeframes using a multivariable, Ordinary Least Squares Regression (OLS). First, we ran a simple, OLS regression using local land use approval steps as the single independent variable, and timeframes as the dependent variable.

We used the statsmodel Python module to run all regressions in this analysis. We calculated all regression coefficients with robust standard errors (Errors of Order 3 (HC3)) to account for the existence of outliers and other issues within the data such as heteroskedasticity (variation in regression errors across our observations) and provide a small sample correction. Note that if we did not use robust standard errors with a small sample and clustered observation correction, the standard errors of our estimates would be smaller, so the standard errors and subsequent hypothesis testing are conservative.[100]

We observe a positive association between approval steps and timeframes. Interpreting the results of this simple regression, an additional approval step is associated with approximately a four-month increase in timeframes. While this positive association exists, our data suggests that observations with little to no local land use steps can take a long time. From this simple regression, we expect a development requiring a discretionary building permit only to take 32 months. Further, out of the 64 observations with less than a single local land use approval step, 23 observations (~36%) are above the mean (~38.6 months) and 26 observations (~41%) are above the median (~34.9 months) timeframe in San Francisco. While this positive association exists, timeframes are variable, regardless of the number of approval steps.

Even if such a relationship between local land use approval steps and timeframes exists, the magnitude of the relationship is, arguably, small. Meaning, the impact of approval steps on timeframes is small. From this simple regression, an additional approval step is associated with an additional ~3.7 months for approval. Given that the mean timeframe for all 111 observations is ~38.56 months, the impact of an additional approval step on timeframes is minimal.

---

[99] We define local land use approval steps as any discrete approval step required for entitlement under local law, not including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance pathway step.

[100] In regression analysis, the errors are defined by the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable (in this case, project timeframes) and values predicted by the regression specification. Accurate estimation of the uncertainty of OLS-predicted values generally depends on constant errors across observations. However, in this study, we do not assume that error is constant (homoscedasticity). For instance, model error might be larger for observations with substantially longer timeframes (i.e., where projects take two to three times longer than the median timeframe). When we use robust standard errors, we no longer assume that errors are constant across all observations, which can mitigate the impacts of this regression analysis being based on observational data. Further, we are using a small sample correction to mitigate the fact that our universe of observations is relatively narrow and to account for the natural clustering in timeframes that occurs at each local land use approval step.

*Figure 6: Regression 2018 - 2021 Observations (No Controls)*




Figure 6 depicts the simple regression of time frames on local land use approval steps. In this graph, the translucent bounds represent the confidence interval for the regression line. Several observations, however, fall outside the bounds of the confidence interval for the regression line. The confidence interval indicates the uncertainty in our regression estimates. This uncertainty could suggest model misspecification.[101] More specifically, the number of approval steps does not adequately capture the variation in project timeframes. **This model misspecification could suggest that there are unaccounted variables that influence the existing relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes.**

[101] A large confidence interval is also often a function of sample size. In other words, because of a limited amount of data, our regression estimates are uncertain. However, we capture a complete dataset of all discretionary, non-ADU entitlements greater than five or more units in 2018 - 2021. Because of this, we are not making statistical inferences based on a sample, but rather generating quantitative analysis on an entire population (and interpreting our results within the context of this population only). Therefore, theoretically, there is no statistical uncertainty through sampling uncertainty.

We controlled for project characteristics that based on interviews and meetings we assumed might influence the relationship between timeframes and the number of local land use approvals. One such example is affordability thresholds. We heard from planners, Commissioners, and Supervisors that the city wants to prioritize 100% affordable development. To control for affordability, we placed the 111 observations into three categories: market-rate, mixed-income, and 100% affordable. To avoid perfect multicollinearity, we did not include the indicator variable which controls for observations that are market-rate. However, due to the model specification, we are still controlling for all affordability classifications in our regression. Below is the distribution of all 111 discretionary observations, by affordability classification:

1) Market-Rate **(N=55)**
2) Mixed-Income **(N=52)**
3) 100% Affordable **(N=4)**

We also controlled for local process characteristics related to the intensity of the approval process—which is distinct from whether an approval process requires more steps. What we are referring to here is how a project proponent may seek only a Variance, or only a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA), or only a Large Project Authorization—and each may require one approval step, but these approval processes are quite different in terms of what we describe as process intensity. A Variance in San Francisco usually requires approval from the Zoning Administrator without a public hearing (though the public may request a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission through the exceptional Discretionary Review process). A Conditional Use Authorization and Large Project Authorization always requires a hearing in front of the Planning Commission. Interviews reveal, however, that the Planning Commissioners interpret the Housing Accountability Act as not applicable to Large Project Authorizations—and that they have the discretion to deny the Large Project Authorization.

Therefore, we wanted to explore whether the *type* of approval process—not necessarily the number of local land use approval steps—is what influences increases in timeframes. We identified five distinct process categories: Discretionary Building Permit, Variance, CUA & PUD, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations, and Legislative Actions. We want to explore whether observations with a more intense process are associated with longer timeframes and, theoretically, more approval steps. Below is the distribution of all 111 discretionary observations, by process category:

1) Discretionary Building Permit (**N=23)**: The building permit category represents a group of observations that are only discretionary by virtue of the Business & Tax Code provision that renders all government approvals discretionary.

2) Variance Only (**N=17**): These are observations that required a variance for approval. The observations do not require any Conditional Use Authorizations, Large Project Exceptions, or Legislative Actions.

3) CUA & PUD (**N=49**): These are observations that required a Conditional Use Authorization or Planned Unit Development (PUD) Approval. The observations do not require any Large Project Exceptions or Legislative Actions.

4) Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations **(N=15)**: These are observations that required either a Downtown Project Authorization or Large Project Authorization. Interviews and meetings indicate that Large Projects face significant hurdles—because they are disfavored. The issue here though is that these large projects may only require one step, and they theoretically seem to be no different than a CUA if we only consider the process in terms of both the number of approval steps and the approval body. However, the procedural step allows for waivers or exceptions to allow for a large project under the planning code. Though these do not appear to require legislative action, interviews suggest that the Planning Commission eschews these approvals, believes that they are not covered by the Housing Accountability Act, and will deny these approvals. That the Planning Commission interprets the Housing Accountability Act as not applying to the LPAs is something planners dispute, as they think this is a faulty interpretation of state law.

5) Legislative Actions (**N=7**): These are observations that required a local legislative act (Planning Code Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, General Plan Amendment, or Development Agreement) for approval.

To assess the impact of process intensity on approval steps, we translated process intensity and incremental numeric ranking in the following order: Discretionary Building Permit (least intense), Variance Only, CUA & PUD, Large Project Authorizations and Downtown Project Authorizations (referred to collectively as Exceptions), Legislative Actions (most intense). After running a simple regression of the number of approval steps on this numeric ranking, we find increasing process intensity is associated with an increase of one approval step (rounded).[102] A project that requires a local legislative act or a development agreement for approval is expected to have three to four more approval steps than a discretionary building permit project. This makes sense, as Development Agreements are often associated with proposals that require multiple approvals. This association is statistically significant at the 1% level. While process intensity and the number of local land use approval steps are related, they are not multicollinear. The correlation coefficient between the numeric translation between process intensity and local land use approval steps is 0.63. In an additional section of this report, we run a correlation heatmap between all independent variables to identify any possible sources of multicollinearity.

We also calculate the variation in the number of approval steps for all process categories. Below is a table that breaks out the quantile distribution of approval steps, by process intensity.

[102] The slope coefficient in the simple regression 0.856.

*Table 16: Variation in Number of Approval Steps, by Process Categories, Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2018 - 2021 (N=111)*

| Process Categorization | Min. Steps | 25th Percentile Steps | **Median Steps** | 75th Percentile Steps | Max. Steps | **Mean Steps** | Standard Steps |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Discretionary Building Permit (N=23)[103] | 0 | 0 | **0** | 0 | 2 | 0.13 | 0.46 |
| Variance (N=17)[104] | 1 | 1 | **1** | 1 | 3 | 1.29 | 0.59 |
| CUA & PUD (N=49)[105] | 1 | 1 | **2** | 2 | 4 | 1.96 | 0.96 |
| Exceptions (N=15)[106] | 1 | 1 | **1** | 2 | 5 | 1.60 | 1.12 |
| Legislative Acts (N=7)[107] | 1 | 3 | **5** | 7 | 9 | 5 | 2.94 |

We highlight this variation to show that process categorizations are not just a categorical grouping of the number of local land use approval steps. For instance, all process categorizations have observations that require a single approval step. However, an observation that requires only a variance is significantly different from an observation that requires only a Large Project Exception. It is because these single approval step processes are so different that we control for process in our analysis.

Finally, we also control for project size and whether the observation was in a vulnerable area. Interviews suggest that larger projects are disfavored. We control for project size (instead of just an LPA or DPA) because some proposed developments benefit from State Density Bonus Law, increasing their size, but they do not necessarily require an LPA or DPA (which is determined in part by location as well). Lastly, we control for location within a priority equity geography because interviews suggest political bodies are sensitive to proposals to build in these areas. These project and neighborhood characteristics can also impact the relationship between local land use approval steps and timeframes.

We completed several regression models to explore whether there is a relationship between number of approval steps and timeframes. Or in other words, does increasing the number of required approval steps create longer entitlement timeframes? **The regression models show that when we control for affordability characteristics, project size, location within a vulnerable geographic area, and intensity of the approval process, there is no**

[103] Out of the 23 discretionary building permit observations, one observation had an additional administrative approval. Another observation required an additional administrative approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval.
[104] There are 13 observations that require only one step or only a variance for approval.
[105] There are 18 observations that require only one step, or only a CUA or PUD for approval.
[106] There are 10 observations that require only one step, or an exception (Downtown Project Authorization or Large Project Authorization) for approval.
[107] There is one observation that required only a legislative act for approval.

**statistically significant association between the number of approval steps and timeframes.**

This outcome supports what stakeholders say to be true in San Francisco—factors outside of law influence timeframes, and there is a lot of uncertainty of how entitlement will unfold in San Francisco no matter what a developer proposes to build. This outcome does not prove that there is no causal relationship between timeframes and approval steps; we cannot account for all confounding variables that influence this relationship. OLS identifies associations within our data only. And we are using observational data, as well. Thus, the data and methods do not allow us to prove or disprove that there is no relationship between number of approval steps and timeframes. **But importantly, the regression findings are consistent with what descriptive statistics and interviews both show—there is no easy entitlement pathway in San Francisco, and factors outside of law appear to influence entitlement outcomes. This tells us that reforms that focus on simplifying discretionary review by reducing the number of steps to approval may be insufficient to address uncertainty and lengthy timeframes to approval.**

## Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 with Controls

Table 17 below shows the association between local land use approval steps and timeframes was numerically smaller and no longer statistically significant after we controlled for affordability, process intensity, and project size. These results indicate that there are factors outside of what the planning and zoning law requires of developers that strongly affect the relationship between approval steps and timeframes.

What Table 17 illustrates is that project size may impact the relationship between approval steps and timeframes in our dataset. When controlling for number of approval steps to understand the relationship between project size and timeframes, an additional unit increase in project size is associated with a 0.021 month increase in timeframes. This relationship is statistically significant at the 5% level.

Another factor that may impact the relationship between approval steps and timeframes is the intensity of the process. An observation requiring a variance or CUA/PUD is associated with an increase in timeframes, relative to a discretionary building permit observation. This relationship is diminished (in terms of significance) but is still present when we add controls. Further, an approval requiring a Large Project Authorization is associated with an increase in timeframes, relative to a discretionary building permit observation—but this association is no longer statistically significant when we add all controls (including project size).

*Table 17: All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021*

| Variables | No Controls | Affordability Controls | Neighborhood Controls | Size Controls | Process Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dependent Variable:** Timeframe (denoted in months) | | | | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 3.693*** | 3.681*** | 3.743*** | 2.794** | 2.761* | 2.360 |
| | (1.244) | (1.353) | (1.260) | (1.117) | (1.637) | (1.755) |
| Market-rate | | 12.706 | | | | 4.160 |
| | | (9.493) | | | | (8.372) |
| Mixed Income | | 12.934 | | | | 6.833 |
| | | (9.242) | | | | (8.970) |
| Vulnerable Area | | | 1.584 | | | 1.307 |
| | | | (3.860) | | | (4.331) |
| Project Size | | | | 0.021** | | 0.028** |
| | | | | (0.011) | | (0.013) |
| Variance | | | | | 19.468** | 20.488** |
| | | | | | (8.799) | (9.149) |
| CUA & PUD | | | | | 12.286*** | 11.115** |
| | | | | | (4.092) | (4.547) |
| Exceptions | | | | | 9.987* | 6.653 |
| | | | | | (5.317) | (6.152) |
| Legis. Acts | | | | | 6.467 | 0.558 |
| | | | | | (9.207) | (11.431) |
| Constant | 32.580*** | 20.246** | 31.714*** | 32.369*** | 23.930*** | 17.656** |
| | (2.653) | (8.889) | (2.854) | (2.587) | (2.567) | (7.260) |
| Observations | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 |
| R-squared | 0.075 | 0.088 | 0.076 | 0.094 | 0.157 | 0.197 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.066 | 0.063 | 0.059 | 0.077 | 0.117 | 0.126 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

## Regression Analysis Using 2014 - 2017 Data

After running a simple regression on approval steps and timeframes using the 2014 - 2017 dataset, we find a positive association between approval steps and timeframes. This association is not statistically significant. In terms of magnitude, the association between local land use approval steps within the 2014 - 2017 dataset is weaker than in the 2018 - 2021 dataset**.**

*Figure 7: Ordinary Least Squares Regression 2014 - 2017 Observations (N=140)*



We also run our regressions on observations that received a Community Plan Exemption (N=100).
We did this to further explore whether local approval steps impact timeframes for projects that satisfy CEQA in the same way.

*Table 18: Regression Using 100 CPE Observations 2014 - 2017*

| Variables | No Controls | Affordability Controls | Neighborhood Controls | Size Controls | Process Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dependent Variable:** Timeframe (denoted in months) | | | | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 3.295 | 3.521 | 3.009 | 4.097 | 4.062 | 2.515 |
| | (2.740) | (3.802) | (2.731) | (2.615) | (7.615) | (6.105) |
| Market-rate | | 15.159*** | | | | 22.226 |
| | | (5.177) | | | | (19.833) |
| Mixed Income | | 12.443* | | | | 23.791 |
| | | (6.614) | | | | (19.983) |
| Vulnerable Area | | | -2.478 | | | -1.423 |
| | | | (3.184) | | | (3.265) |
| Project Size | | | | -0.019 | | 0.002 |
| | | | | (0.022) | | (0.028) |
| Variance | | | | | 4.305 | 3.071 |
| | | | | | (9.589) | (9.902) |
| CUA & PUD | | | | | -5.188 | -6.306 |
| | | | | | (10.667) | (10.416) |
| Exceptions | | | | | -4.053 | -3.885 |
| | | | | | (19.060) | (17.804) |
| Legis. Acts | | | | | 10.918 | 20.784 |
| | | | | | (34.670) | (35.476) |
| Constant | 24.966*** | 11.406** | 26.813*** | 25.232*** | 25.700*** | 6.351 |
| | (3.513) | (5.124) | (4.363) | (3.667) | (2.779) | (19.031) |
| Observations | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| R-squared | 0.055 | 0.086 | 0.061 | 0.061 | 0.119 | 0.196 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.046 | 0.057 | 0.042 | 0.042 | 0.072 | 0.092 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

## Regressions Using 2014 - 2021 Data

We ran our regression models on the entire 2014 - 2021 dataset. We find no differences in our main findings above. Figure 3 depicts the simple regression of time frames on local land use approval steps. We found a positive association between number of approval steps and timeframes that is statistically significant. In this graph, the translucent bounds represent the confidence interval for the regression line. As was true in the regression of 2018 - 2021 data only, several observations fall outside the bounds of the confidence interval for the regression line. The confidence interval indicates the uncertainty in our regression estimates. This uncertainty suggests that there are other unaccounted variables that influence the existing relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

*Figure 8: Regression All Non-ADU Discretionary Observations 2014 - 2021 (No Controls)*



Our results using the 2014 - 2021 dataset also show that when we control for affordability characteristics, project size, location within a vulnerable geographic area, and intensity of the approval process, there is no statistically significant association between the number of approval steps and timeframes.

We also add an additional model where we only exclude process controls. We find that there exists a positive, statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframes when we only control for affordability, project size, and area characteristics, but this relationship is numerically smaller and decreases in statistical significance when we add these controls.

*Table 19: Regression All Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2014 - 2021 With Controls*

| Variables | No Controls | Affordability Controls | Neighborhood Controls | Size Controls | Process Controls | All Controls Except Process Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dependent Variable:** Timeframe (denoted in months) | | | | | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 3.328*** | 3.363*** | 3.149*** | 2.882*** | 2.998** | 2.643** | 2.263 |
| | (1.019) | (1.034) | (0.990) | (1.043) | (1.470) | (1.046) | (1.453) |
| Market-rate | | 14.441*** | | | | 13.854*** | 11.718** |
| | | (4.756) | | | | (5.168) | (5.446) |
| Mixed Income | | 12.003*** | | | | 11.610** | 10.510* |
| | | (4.539) | | | | (4.933) | (5.497) |
| Vulnerable Area | | | -3.878 | | | -3.577 | -3.798 |
| | | | (2.494) | | | (2.574) | (2.588) |
| Project Size | | | | 0.009 | | 0.012 | 0.016 |
| | | | | (0.010) | | (0.010) | (0.011) |
| Variance | | | | | 10.836* | | 10.407* |
| | | | | | (5.620) | | (5.763) |
| CUA & PUD | | | | | 4.266 | | 3.413 |
| | | | | | (3.793) | | (4.122) |
| Exceptions | | | | | 0.859 | | -0.183 |
| | | | | | (4.628) | | (5.428) |
| Legis. Acts | | | | | 5.815 | | 4.783 |
| | | | | | (8.056) | | (9.030) |
| Constant | 29.094*** | 16.346*** | 31.460*** | 28.968*** | 26.008*** | 18.847*** | 17.794*** |
| | (2.013) | (4.357) | (2.548) | (2.026) | (2.466) | (4.943) | (5.063) |
| Observations | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 | 251 |
| R-squared | 0.052 | 0.070 | 0.061 | 0.055 | 0.080 | 0.082 | 0.109 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.048 | 0.059 | 0.053 | 0.047 | 0.062 | 0.063 | 0.076 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses.

It is not typical for a development to have eight to nine steps to entitlement in San Francisco. Because it is possible that the relationship between approval steps and timeframes is driven by atypical projects in San Francisco (or observations that require eight or nine steps for approval), we also analyze the impact of outliers (in terms of the number of approval steps) on the relationship between approval steps and timeframes. Any observation in our discretionary, non-ADU dataset from 2018 - 2021 with more than four approval steps is considered an outlier.[108] We dropped these from our dataset and reran our regression models in the table below.

*Table 20: Regression Results, Dropping Approval Step Outliers (2014 - 2021 Data)*

| Variables | No Controls | Some Controls | All Controls |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dependent Variable: Timeframe (denoted by months) | | | |
| Num. Approvals | 1.987* | 1.685 | -0.756 |
| | (1.133) | (1.309) | (1.928) |
| Market-rate | | 17.294*** | 14.218*** |
| | | (3.723) | (3.982) |
| Mixed Income | | 15.522*** | 12.450*** |
| | | (3.397) | (4.428) |
| Vulnerable Area | | -1.829 | -2.090 |
| | | (2.666) | (2.683) |
| Project Size | | 0.006 | 0.010 |
| | | (0.012) | (0.013) |
| Variance | | | 13.440** |
| | | | (6.072) |
| CUA & PUD | | | 6.949 |
| | | | (4.802) |
| Exceptions | | | 7.935 |
| | | | (5.780) |
| Legs. Acts | | | 9.840 |
| | | | (7.396) |
| Constant | 30.585*** | 15.720*** | 15.110*** |
| | (2.205) | (3.880) | (4.142) |
| Observations | 229 | 229 | 229 |
| R-squared | 0.010 | 0.041 | 0.075 |
| Adj. R-Squared | 0.005 | 0.020 | 0.037 |

Notes: *** indicates coefficient is significant at the 1% level. ** indicates coefficient is significant at the 5% level. * indicates coefficient is significant at the 10% percent level. Table presents robust standard errors in parentheses

[108] We calculated the bounds for large outliers (based on the number of approval steps) with the following formula: 1.5 * [75% Percentile – 25% Percentile] + 75% Percentile. For all 251 observations, the 25% percentile is one approval step and the 75th percentile is two approval steps. Using this formula, 1.5 * (2 – 1) + 2 = 3.5. Meaning, any observations with more than four approval steps are outliers.

We observe a positive association between approval steps and timeframes when we discard outlier observations, although this association is numerically smaller and decreases in statistical significance. When we exclude process controls in our regression—and only control for affordability, project size, and neighborhood characteristics—we find no statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframes. This suggests that the observations which required significantly more steps for approval play a role in the association between approval steps and timeframes. In other words, when we discard these observations to generate a dataset of more typical developments in San Francisco, we find no statistically significant association between approval steps and timeframe, controlling for factors outside of planning and zoning law. This also suggests that a more typical observation (an observation with two or three steps) would likely see no substantial difference in timeframe if it have been approved with fewer steps.

## Robustness Checks for Analysis

We generated correlation heat maps to understand existing associations between the independent variables in our models. If high correlations exist between our independent variables, it could lead to imperfect multicollinearity.

In the following correlation heat maps, the only variables that are highly associated with each other are indicator variables that are mutually exclusive and exhaustive. As a result of these heatmaps, we feel comfortable using these variables as independent variables in our regression.




*Figure 9: Correlation Heat Map for 2018 - 2021 Regression Data (N=111) with Affordability, Neighborhood, and Process Characteristics*

Residual Plots for Regressions

We also run residual plots for some of our models for assessment. First, we use the residual plots to assess our model's functional form (e.g., is the association between the number of approval steps and timeframes linear?). We also use residual plots to assess the effectiveness of our control variables. We are interested in understanding if the introduction of these control variables help capture the underlying associations within our data.

*Figure 10: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("No Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021*



*Figure 11: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("All Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021*




In Figure 10: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("No Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Non-Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021, there is clustering in this plot. This indicates that the simple regression model is missing information to properly explain the relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes. It strongly indicates that there are factors outside the number of approval steps that impacts the linear relationship between timeframes.

Figure 11: Residual Plot and LOESS Line for Simple Regression ("All Controls" in Table 1) Using All 111 Discretionary Non-ADU Observations 2018 - 2021 shows the residual plot of the regression specification when we control for process intensity, project size, neighborhood vulnerability, whether the project received an administrative appeal, and affordability. The clustering in this residual plot is less pronounced, which indicates that the controls are effective

in capturing sources of variation that influence the relationship between the number of approval steps and timeframes. Also, observe that there is no clear, consistent pattern in the residual plot. This indicates that a linear regression is most likely the best functional form for our model.

However, observe that the LOESS line is not a linear line at zero, but is rather slightly sloping downward. This indicates that there may be other omitted variables that impact the relationship between timeframes and approval steps, which may bias the magnitude of our regression estimates. Future regression work can test the use of interactive effects between independent variables or assess the impact of new control variables.

## Appendix B: Spatial Distribution of Developments

Affordability and TCAC Category Cross Sectional Table (N=144), 2018 - 2021[1]

| Highest Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 10 | 352 | - | 29.38 | 30.91 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 1 | 5 | - | 6.41 | 6.41 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 3 | 150 | 38 | 28.21 | 31.34 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 1[2] | 135 | 135 | 15.39 | 15.39 |
| **High Resource** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 9 | 328 | - | 39.81 | 38.15 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 6 | 47 | - | 9.63 | 17.20 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 6 | 242 | 43 | 53.51 | 53.48 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 2 | 19 | 19 | 9.53 | 9.53 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 2 | 228 | 228 | 4.47 | 4.47 |
| **Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing to higher resources)** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 4 | 47 | - | 32.74 | 37.44 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 1 | 7 | - | 21.99 | 21.99 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 3 | 237 | 81 | 32.08 | 28.48 |
| Mixed Inc.(ADU) | 1 | 24 | 3 | 41.19 | 41.19 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 2[3] | 268 | 267 | 26.20 | 26.20 |
| **Moderate Resource** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 18 | 1,555 | - | 40.41 | 40.30 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 6 | 38 | - | 26.50 | 24.38 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 21 | 2,564 | 520 | 41.03 | 40.67 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 1 | 178 | 176 | 28.04 | 28.04 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 2 | 175 | 173 | 4.65 | 4.65 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 1[4] | 63 | 63 | 41.39 | 41.39 |
| **Low Resource** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 14 | 1,982 | - | 38.45 | 47.15 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 19 | 1,153 | 191 | 27.58 | 33.47 |
| Mixed Inc.(Always SB 35) | 2 | 720 | 294 | 6.84 | 6.84 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 1 | 15 | 15 | 55.96 | 55.96 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 3 | 400 | 400 | 2.40 | 2.40 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began as Disc.) | 3[5] | 394 | 393 | 32.58 | 30.70 |

| High Segregation & Poverty | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 2 | 13 | - | 19.04 | 19.04 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 0 | - | - | - | - |

[1] Observations that are student or group housing developments have been categorized as market-rate. We confirmed that group housing beds are not deed-restricted affordable.
[2] This is 1360 43rd Ave, originally proposed under 1351 42nd Ave. This project began as a discretionary entitlement. We use the earliest file date to calculate timeframes.
[3] The two SB 35 projects in this category of Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) began before SB 35 was signed into law, which influences timeframe calculations in this neighborhood classification. We logged one project, 2340 San Jose Ave, as having an earliest file date of 9/21/2017. We logged a second project, 4840 Mission St, as having an earliest file date of 9/21/2016. Further, 2340 San Jose Ave does not have an eligibility determination date, though we know it received a building permit. But we excluded it from timeframe analysis.
[4] This is 2205 Mission St, which began as a discretionary project.
[5] Three SB 35 projects in this category (Low Resource) began before SB 35 was signed into law.

## Affordability and 2021 TCAC Category Cross Sectional Table, 2014 - 2017

| Highest Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 3 | 69 | - | 89.98 | 79.68 |
| Mixed Income | 1 | 41 | 6 | 38.70 | 38.70 |
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| High Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate | 6 | 120 | - | 23.79 | 24.77 |
| Mixed Income | 5 | 287 | 27 | 18.94 | 20.92 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 4 | 100 | - | 19.50 | 21.48 |
| Mixed Income | 3 | 527 | 171 | 34.26 | 32.10 |
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Moderate Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 29 | 2415 | - | 26.37 | 34.31 |
| Mixed Income | 25 | 3071 | 415 | 31.59 | 35.11 |
| 100% Affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Low Resource | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 20 | 1600 | - | 23.98 | 27.17 |
| Mixed Income | 39 | 5472 | 982 | 31.23 | 30.30 |
| 100% Affordable | 4 | 400 | 400 | 13.73 | 14.16 |
| High Segregation & Poverty | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
| Market-rate | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| Mixed Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 100% Affordable | 1 | 167 | 167 | 34.49 | 34.49 |

Affordability and Priority Equity Geographies (PEG) Sectional Table, 2018 - 2021 (N=144)

| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by PEG | Projects | Units | Affordable Units | Median Time | Mean Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market-rate(Discretionary) | 26 | 2,377 | - | 36.85 | 43.54 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 6 | 37 | - | 21.70 | 22.56 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 35 | 2,424 | 468 | 32.09 | 34.97 |
| Mixed Inc.(Always SB 35) | 1 | 270 | 109 | 6.05 | 6.05 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 1 | 24 | 3 | 41.19 | 41.19 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 1 | 15 | 15 | 55.96 | 55.96 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 4[2] | 512 | 510 | 2.91 | 3.31 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began As Disc.) | 6 | 725 | 723 | 32.58 | 31.94 |
| **Not In a Vulnerable Area, Denoted by PEG** | **Projects** | **Units** | **Affordable Units** | **Median Time** | **Mean Time** |
| Market-rate | 29 | 1,88773 | - | 36.00 | 36.40 |
| Market-rate(ADU) | 10 | | - | 9.71 | 18.07 |
| Mixed Inc.(Discretionary) | 17 | 1,922 | 405 | 42.44 | 45.09 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 1 | 450 | 185 | 7.63 | 7.63 |
| 100% Aff.(Discretionary) | 3 | 197 | 195 | 11.31 | 15.70 |
| 100% Aff.(Always SB 35) | 3 | 291 | 291 | 2.76 | 3.90 |
| 100% Aff.(SB 35–Began As Disc.) | 1 | 135 | 135 | 15.39 | 15.30 |

**Distribution of Affordable Units (Inclusive of 11 Observations From Updated APR)**

2014 - 2015 Affordable Units, by 2021 TCAC Distribution (N=351 new affordable units)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | 0 | 0.00% |
| High Resource | 3 | 3.70% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | 0 | 0.00% |
| Moderate Resource | 194 | 55 .27% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Low Resource | 144 | 41.03% |
| High Segregation and Poverty | 0 | 0.00% |

2016 - 2017 Affordable Units Distribution, by 2021 TCAC (N=1,817 new affordable units)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | 6 | 0.33% |
| High Resource | 14 | 0.77% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | 171 | 9.41% |
| Moderate Resource | 221 | 12.16% |
| Low Resource | 1,238 | 68.13% |
| High Segregation and Poverty | 167 | 9.19% |

2018 - 2019 Affordable Units Distribution by 2021 TCAC, Expanded by SB 35 Affordable Units (N=1,390 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=896)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | Total: 22<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 22 | Total: 1.58% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| High Resource | Total: 17<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 17 | Total: 1.22% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | Total: 336<br>● SB 35: 267<br>● Non SB 35: 69 | Total: 24.17% |
| Moderate Resource | Total: 321<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 321 | Total: 23.09% |
| Low Resource | Total: 694<br>● SB 35: 629<br>● Non SB 35: 65 | Total: 49.93% |
| High Segregation and Poverty | Total: 0<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 0 | Total: 0.00% |

2020 - 2021 Affordable Units Distribution by 2021 TCAC, Expanded by SB 35 Affordable Units (N=1,649 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=1,057)

| Neighborhood TCAC Category | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Highest Resource | Total: 151<br>● SB 35: 135<br>● Non SB 35: 16 | Total: 9.16% |
| High Resource | Total: 273<br>● SB 35: 228<br>● Non SB 35: 45 | Total: 16.56% |
| Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing) | Total: 15<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 15 | Total: 0.91% |
| Moderate Resource | Total: 611<br>● SB 35: 236<br>● Non SB 35: 375 | Total: 37.05% |
| Low Resource | Total: 599<br>● SB 35: 458<br>● Non SB 35: 141 | Total: 36.33% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| High Segregation and Poverty | Total: 0<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non SB 35: 0 | Total: 0.00% |

**Distribution of Affordable Units, by Priority Equity Geographies**

2014 - 2015 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=351 new affordable units)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 154 | 43.87% |
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 197 | 56.13% |

2016 - 2017 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,817 new affordable units)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 282 | 15.52% |
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | 1,535 | 84.48% |

2018 - 2019 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,390 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=896)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 294<br>● SB 35: 0<br>● Non-SB 35: 294 | Total: 21.15% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 1,096<br>• SB 35: 896<br>• Non-SB 35: 200 | Total: 78.85% |

2020 - 2021 Affordable Units by Priority Equity Geographies (N=1,649 new affordable units, SB 35 affordable units=1,057)

| | Total Affordable Units in Category | Percentage (of Total Affordable Units) |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 732<br>• SB 35: 446<br>• Non-SB 35: 286 | Total: 44.39% |
| NOT in a vulnerable Area, Denoted by Priority Equity Geographies | Total: 917<br>• SB 35: 611<br>• Non-SB 35: 306 | Total: 55.61% |

Number and Percentage of 100% Affordable Developments in Areas with a Higher Density of Vulnerable Populations, by Year.

| Year | Number of 100% Affordable Entitlements | Percentage of 100% Affordable Entitlements in Sensitive Geographies |
|---|---|---|
| 2014 – 2017 (N=5) | Total: 5 | Total: 100% |
| 2018 – 2019 (N=8) | Total: 6<br>• SB 35: 6<br>• Discretionary Non-ADU: 0 | Total: 75% |
| 2020 – 2021 (N=10) | Total: 5<br>• SB 35: 4<br>• Discretionary Non-ADU: 1 | Total: 50% |

**Appendix C: Analysis of Accuracy of Annual Progress Report Data on Entitlements and SB 35 Approvals**

We relied on Annual Progress Report data that we pulled over three periods. For the 2018 - 2019 analysis, we first built a list of observations from 2018 - 2019 APR data that we gained access to on May 18, 2020. We began collecting data on these observations for related research during the 2021 - 2022 academic year, prior to working with HCD on this study. We did not collect as much information as we did for this research during that period, however. We then downloaded San Francisco's Original 2020 - 2021 APR data on or around October 2, 2022, to construct our original observation list for data collection. We then downloaded 2021 APR data on February 18, 2023. Then we downloaded all four years—2018 - 2021—APR data on July 14, 2023, from the state data dashboard to do a final check to confirm if we had any additional observations that may have come in through corrected reporting for any one of these four years. We also separately reviewed environmental review determinations to identify any possible observations not included in any APR data.

San Francisco reported 72 entitlements or SB 35 approvals in 2018 and 2019 on the report we accessed dated May 18, 2020.

- Of the 72 entitlements or SB 35 approvals from 2018 - 2019, we determined that 45 of these observations (~63%) were entitled in 2018 - 2019 and reported in the correct year.
- Therefore, 27 entitlements or SB 35 approvals (~38%) in the 2018 - 2019 APR (N=72) were incorrect reports.
- We found an additional seven entitlements or SB 35 approvals issued in 2018 - 2019 that San Francisco reported in another year (or the wrong year).
- The 2018 - 2019 APR Report also missed 33 entitlements issued in those years, which we found from reviewing San Francisco's Environmental Review Documents and Planning Commission Agendas.

San Francisco reported 82 observations entitled in 2020. San Francisco reported 30 entitlements or SB 35 approvals in 2021. Combined, San Francisco reported 112 entitlements or SB 35 approvals across 2020 - 2021.

- Of the 112 observations from 2020 - 2021, we determined that 45 of these observations (~40%) were entitled in 2020 - 2021 and San Francisco reported the correct year.
- We found an additional 18 entitlements or SB 35 approvals issued in 2020 - 2021 that San Francisco reported, but reported as entitled in the wrong year.
- 67 observations (~60%) in the 2020 - 2021 APR (N=112) are incorrect reports.
- Most, or 62 (out of 67), incorrect reports in the 2020 - 2021 APR are from Reporting Year 2020.
- The 2020 - 2021 APR data also missed an additional 21 entitlements, which we found through reviewing environmental review determinations.

In the inaccurate reporting across 2018 - 2021, we determined six entitlements that San Francisco incorrectly reported in 2018 - 2021 were entitled sometime in 2014 - 2017.

We also used the July 14, 2023, download of San Francisco's Annual Progress Reports to HCD a final time to run a second audit of the 2018 - 2021 APR before completing all analysis. In total, San Francisco underreported on 69 entitlements or SB 35 approvals across those four years.

December 1, 2025

**Re: Board File No. 250701**
**Family Rezoning.**

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Supervisor Chyanne Chen
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Dear Supervisors:

Attached are comments submitted to the Planning Commission for the June 26, 2025 hearing regarding the Financial Feasibility Study for the Rezoning. This Financial Feasibility Study from Century Urban is dated June 17, 2025.

The point of the comments attached was to highlight the issue of speculative development under the Rezoning and the fact that per the Study the smaller residential lots throughout the City were the most prime for redevelopment.

***These lots of 25' x 100' are the most widespread**, the most typical lot in San Francisco and they are the lots that contain most of the City's existing housing*.

This coupled with the October 2021 analysis of SB 9 that is also discussed in the attached comments should make everyone nervous.

Not nervous about the Builder's Remedy because that threat has been neutralized by the Family Rezoning once passed by this Board which is a foregone conclusion, but nervous for the impacts from a new round of speculative fever that will hurt a lot of people.

The Board should seek to **mitigate** this speculative fever. Here are a few suggestions:

**Strongest possible tenant protections enshrined in the TPO.**

**Protect housing in the Priority Equity Geographies.**

**Lobby Sacramento to remove the Priority Equity Geographies from SB 423 and the State Density Bonus.**

**Require updates from the Planning Department and DBI on the loss of existing housing and the type and tenure of the replacement housing under the Family Rezoning.**

Sincerely,

Georgia Schuttish

cc: Board of Supervisors, John Carroll, Family Rezoning Planning Staff

CLERK OF LUT

**June 26, 2025**
To: Planning Commission
From: Georgia Schuttish
Re: **Family Zoning (No. 2021-005878CWP) Financial Feasibility Studies**

Previous Century Urban studies released in December 2021 for SB 9 projects and January/May 2022 for small multi-unit project prototypes were analyzed to be "financially challenging".

"Challenging" is also a buzzword for the prototypes under the currently proposed Rezoning in the new C/U studies. See page 8 of the C/U Conceptual Analysis for this hearing. **It reads**:

*"Across the prototypes, feasibility is generally **challenged** under the analyzed market conditions, even with analyzed adaptations to zoning and planning rules and with the use of density bonus programs. This result reflects the general development environment but does not necessarily mean that all projects are infeasible, as certain projects may have different circumstances from the prototypes....fundamental macro-economic conditions changed materially from 2021 to 2023 and increased the feasibility threshold for new development."*

However see the Executive Summary from Staff for this hearing on pages 24 - 25. There are two paragraphs that caught my attention as to what development becomes more financially feasible, or less "challenging" under the "improved case" assumptions. **They read**:

*"In particular, some of the development types that will be enabled by the rezoning, including low- and mid-rise multifamily buildings, show positive RLVs under these improved economic assumptions, particularly under the "high" submarket assumptions. These are the most common development sites in the rezoned areas, including the mid-rise commercial corridors zoned for 65', **and the residential areas off the corridors.***

*Overall, 12 of 98 prototypes resulted in an RLV greater than $75k/unit under improved conditions in the high submarket. Of those, there are a few anomalies with substantially high RLV that were established for illustrative purposes only and do not reflect realistic development prototypes that would be constructed. **The smallest site prototype measuring 2,500 square feet was the only prototype with every single iteration across both residential tenures that demonstrated a positive RLV under the improved market conditions.**"*

This ***2,500 square feet*** lot is the predominant lot size in the residential neighborhoods. This includes the lots on blocks ***"off the corridors"***. And these lots usually have existing housing. (Most lots are 25' x 114" which is 2,850 sq. feet or 350 sq. feet more than the prototype.)

If these San Francisco lots with existing, sound housing are the least challenging, due to a ***"positive RLV under the improved market conditions"***, that sounds like the opportunity for **speculation**. *And as many fear, it also sounds like **"Redevelopment 2.0"** will happen in the residential blocks due to this Rezoning plan. Previously, I thought this was a little bit hyperbolic to compare the Rezoning to the devastation wrought by Redevelopment in the last century.*

*Now based on these Financial Feasibility studies, I think it is perfectly and completely accurate.*

Along this line, please look again at another document from Planning Staff. In the October 21, 2021 Executive Summary for SB 9, Case No. 2018-016522CWP, page 14, there are several points that connect back to the feasibility issues of the 2,500 square foot lots. **It reads:**

*" Many areas of the city with lower land values, high percentages of households of color, and/or with lower outcomes in health, wealth, and life expectancy also have high rates of owner-occupied single family housing, for example, **the Bayview** (73%), **Visitation Valley** (70%), and **Outer Mission** (75%). SB 9 may offer these homeowners the opportunity to add units for extended families or to generate rental income, or gain wealth through lot splits. However, there are significant hurdles to realize these gains. Acquiring financing for project development, navigating a complex permitting process, and having the resiliency to manage the significant disruption and take financial risks of construction are major barriers facing existing homeowners in communities of color and low-income communities. **Without City investment in programs that support owner-occupied development, such as construction loans or funding prioritized for owners of color or low-income owners, the more straightforward option would be for existing owners to sell their property, or "cash out," and leave San Francisco for areas with lower home costs**. While the bill includes a provision that the applicant of an SB 9 lot split is required to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the lot split approval, it does not apply to SB 9 project without the lot split. And while selling may financially benefit an individual household, this practice has been incrementally devastating to communities of color, Cultural Districts, and areas of the city where residents have a common sense of cultural identity, and a historic and major loss to San Francisco as a whole."*

This issue of a ***"cash out"*** is extremely concerning for all the **Priority Equity Geography SUD** neighborhoods cited above, plus the Excelsior, Crocker-Amazon, the Portola, the Mission, etc.

The Policy and the Findings in **Ordinance 248-23** are written to protect existing, sound housing in these neighborhoods for the residents. The **PEG SUD** neighborhoods are also subject to **SB 423,** which is contrary to the intent of the Ordinance.

And the ***"cash out"*** issue could be problematic throughout the City. Not every homeowner on the Westside is rich, even if they have owned and lived in their house for years.

*Again, the most common residential lot size is 25' x 114' or slightly more than 2,500 sq. ft.*

**Mayor Lurie and the Board of Supervisors,**

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over $10 million dollars. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters it was their intention to spend the revenue from the new tax on a Social Housing Program. Social Housing is housing that is municipally-owned (or non-profit owned), permanently affordable, and available to a wider mix income than traditional public housing.

Mayor Breed overruled the Board of Supervisors and instead put the funds raised from the transfer tax into the city's general fund, and not in the Social Housing Program. The public then had to fight to claw that money back to build affordable housing projects like 730 Stanyan, which is a new 100% affordable housing development at the end of Haight St.

We're asking Mayor Lurie to fund the Social Housing Program via the Housing Stability Fund. **We're also asking the Board of Supervisors to pass another resolution reassuring voters that this Board supports expending Prop I property transfer tax revenue on the Social Housing Program.** We're asking the Mayor and the Board to also oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax unless substitute funding for the Social Housing Program is secured.

**Sincerely,**
**San Franciscans for Social Housing**

# San Franciscans for Social Housing

| # | Name | Zip Code |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Honest B. | 94117 |
| 2 | Andrew S. | 94122 |
| 3 | Cary S. | 94122 |
| 4 | Anonymous | 94122 |
| 5 | Shelley P. | 94109 |
| 6 | Julian N. | 94117 |
| 7 | Hannah S. | 94117 |
| 8 | Luke O. | 94109 |
| 9 | Nicholas N. | 94102 |
| 10 | Molly B. | 94103 |
| 11 | Samy B. | 94102 |
| 12 | Melissa H. | 94112 |
| 13 | Leon A. | 94102 |
| 14 | Ossie F. | 94109 |
| 15 | Mikel-Anne G. | 94109 |
| 16 | Daniel C. | 94103 |
| 17 | Benjamin B. | 94115 |
| 18 | Ian D. | 94122 |
| 19 | emmanuel S. | 94104 |
| 20 | andrea G. | 94117 |
| 21 | Ellisa F. | 94117 |
| 22 | Steven B. | 94109 |
| 23 | Ualtar O. | 94115 |
| 24 | James L. | 94122 |
| 25 | Amy M. | 94117 |
| 26 | Daniel G. | 94121 |
| 27 | Gay C. | 94117 |
| 28 | Maximillian H. | 94118 |
| 29 | Laeli G. | 94117 |
| 30 | Norman D. | 94117 |
| 31 | Patrick C. | 94117 |
| 32 | Lea Y. | 94103 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 33 | Justin F. | 94117 |
| 34 | Francisco H. | 94117 |
| 35 | Domingo D. | 94112 |
| 36 | Dylan H. | 94122 |
| 37 | Shoshannah F. | 94115 |
| 38 | John M. | 94117 |
| 39 | Adrianna B. | 94105 |
| 40 | Yael C. | 94117 |
| 41 | Dylan H. | 94103 |
| 42 | Journey R. | 94102 |
| 43 | James L. | 94114 |
| 44 | Robin L. | 94114 |
| 45 | Nancy N. | 94115 |
| 46 | Anonymous | 94117 |
| 47 | Heike H. | 94115 |
| 48 | Mahal M. | 94133 |
| 49 | Georgia S. | 94115 |
| 50 | Carmen K. | 94114 |
| 51 | Ryan R. | 94115 |
| 52 | Ashley C. | 94110 |
| 53 | Julia B. | 94110 |
| 54 | Simon P. | 9411p |
| 55 | W H H. | 94117 |
| 56 | Tom R. | 94110 |
| 57 | J P. | 94117 |
| 58 | Zachary W. | 94115 |
| 59 | Sean K. | 94112 |
| 60 | Robert A. | 94110 |
| 61 | Martha A. | 94122 |
| 62 | Lucy M. | 94117 |
| 63 | Carolyn C. | 94110 |
| 64 | Deirdre K. | 94122 |
| 65 | Anonymous | 94706 |
| 66 | Zoë M. | 94118 |
| 67 | crystal A. | 94118 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 68 | Maddie F. | 60126 |
| 69 | Tommy Y. | 94118 |
| 70 | Ethan Z. | 94117 |
| 71 | STEVEN M. | 94122 |
| 72 | Shara T. | 94118 |
| 73 | Wingtung H. | 94134 |
| 74 | collin S. | 94116" |
| 75 | Caden T. | 94124 |
| 76 | Kayla S. | 92147 |
| 77 | Andrew Z. | 97103 |
| 78 | Steve S. | 94110 |
| 79 | Ciela O. | 94131 |
| 80 | Terren K. | 94131 |
| 81 | Kayce H. | 94117 |
| 82 | Ying L. | 94110 |
| 83 | Aila B. | 94112 |
| 84 | Cam Y. | 94109 |
| 85 | Anonymous | 94122 |
| 86 | Vivienne H. | 94115 |
| 87 | Marissa O. | 94102 |
| 88 | Casey H. | 94122 |
| 89 | Orianna O. | 94114 |
| 90 | Shayna K. | 94102 |
| 91 | Tracey Q. | 94118 |
| 92 | Robin P. | 94131 |
| 93 | Rowan A. | 94110 |
| 94 | Samuel W. | 94117 |
| 95 | Peter G. | 94103 |
| 96 | Bruce H. | 94110 |
| 97 | Michael M. | 94087 |
| 98 | Miles G. | 94118 |
| 99 | Clayton H. | 94110 |
| 100 | Katie B. | 94122 |
| 101 | Milo G. | 94117 |
| 102 | James G. | 94110 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 103 | Anita K. | 94110 |
| 104 | Maryann H. | 94117 |
| 105 | Savannah W. | 94123 |
| 106 | Jacob L. | 94116 |
| 107 | Sophia C. | 94116 |
| 108 | Michael N. | 94102 |
| 109 | Azucena M. | 94132 |
| 110 | Julia C. | 94118 |
| 111 | Susannah M. | 94103 |
| 112 | JONATHAN A. | 94112 |
| 113 | Vlada L. | 94114 |
| 114 | Francesca T. | 94122 |
| 115 | Terlron N. | 94124 |
| 116 | Justin M. | 94116 |
| 117 | John N. | 94117 |
| 118 | Yasmin H. | 94110 |
| 119 | Samuel A. | 94122 |
| 120 | Scott F. | 94110 |
| 121 | Paul W. | 94115 |
| 122 | Lara K. | 94131 |
| 123 | Franklin J. | 94122 |
| 124 | James A. | 94110 |
| 125 | Judith E. | 94118 |
| 126 | Nadine M. | 94118 |
| 127 | Carol B. | 94115 |
| 128 | Frederic B. | 94103 |
| 129 | Rishav R. | 94110 |
| 130 | Andy M. | 94115 |
| 131 | Selah M. | 94124 |
| 132 | Julia G. | 94118 |
| 133 | Andrew B. | 94122 |
| 134 | Matisse E. | 94110 |
| 135 | Allyson O. | 94122 |
| 136 | Natalie N. | 94117 |
| 137 | Ian A. | 94110 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 138 | Markus D. | 94114 |
| 139 | Graham C. | 94117 |
| 140 | Maanas N. | 94109 |
| 141 | Annette M. | 94110 |
| 142 | Nastasia M. | 94108 |
| 143 | Alex S. | 94132 |
| 144 | Savana B. | 94103 |
| 145 | Andrew S. | 94122 |
| 146 | Jake M. | 02906 |
| 147 | Holly H. | 94117 |
| 148 | Giulio S. | 94110 |
| 149 | Johnathon J. | 94112 |
| 150 | Cedric H. | 94117 |
| 151 | Johnathan W. | 94122 |
| 152 | Haley M. | 94117 |
| 153 | Margot C. | 49740 |
| 154 | Raphael L. | 94110 |
| 155 | Karl T. | 94112 |
| 156 | Bianca M. | 94110 |
| 157 | Sarah D. | 94606 |
| 158 | leah M. | 94114 |
| 159 | Nicolette A. | 94114 |
| 160 | Sophia C. | 94110 |
| 161 | Nicolette A. | 94114 |
| 162 | Langford P. | 94114 |
| 163 | Erin T. | 94116 |
| 164 | Graham S. | 94110 |
| 165 | David W. | 94110 |
| 166 | Langford P. | 94114 |
| 167 | Terese T. | 94114 |
| 168 | Julia T. | 94121 |
| 169 | Joscelyn M. | 94114 |
| 170 | Kaitlyn Y. | 94109 |
| 171 | Hosam K. | 94107 |
| 172 | Arturo G. | 94114 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 173 | Mary W. | 94116 |
| 174 | David S. | 94122 |
| 175 | Jenna M. | 94101 |
| 176 | Anonymous | 94114 |
| 177 | Paul H. | 94122 |
| 178 | Brandy S. | 94109 |
| 179 | Elizabeth Q. | 94110 |
| 180 | Carl S. | 94103 |
| 181 | Richard G. | 94110 |
| 182 | Cornelius M. | 94110 |
| 183 | Lanaii C. | 94111 |
| 184 | Justin P. | 94117 |
| 185 | Truce H. | 94117 |
| 186 | Tony C. | 94122 |
| 187 | denise C. | 94122 |
| 188 | Stan P. | 94110 |
| 189 | Jan M. | 94114 |
| 190 | Carlos D. | 94102 |
| 191 | Marc S. | 94131 |
| 192 | Navi H. | 94601 |
| 193 | Anonymous | 94114 |
| 194 | Nicole S. | 94118 |
| 195 | Serge B. | 94112 |
| 196 | Graham I. | 94121 |
| 197 | Alejandro P. | 94124 |
| 198 | Cat S. | 94122 |
| 199 | Stephanie B. | 94118 |
| 200 | Caroline A. | 94103 |
| 201 | Devin G. | 13901 |
| 202 | Joseph B. | 94131 |
| 203 | Amaya S. | 94122 |
| 204 | Catherine P. | 94114 |
| 205 | Joshua S. | 94133 |
| 206 | Arthur A. | 94114 |
| 207 | Elizabeth Anne M. | 94122 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 208 | Claire K. | 94114 |
| 209 | Caroline R. | 94118 |
| 210 | Sabina J. | 94117 |
| 211 | Francesca P. | 94117 |
| 212 | Jesss B. | 94114 |
| 213 | Renee A. | 94112 |
| 214 | Nathanael Y. | 94118 |
| 215 | Katy R. | 94121 |
| 216 | Kaitlin F. | 94118 |
| 217 | Leland G. | 94111 |
| 218 | Sabrina H. | 94117 |
| 219 | Monique K. | 94122 |
| 220 | William J. | 94158 |
| 221 | Alijah L. | 94110 |
| 222 | Nathalie C. | 94115 |
| 223 | Vicente V. | 94115 |
| 224 | Maggie G. | 94110 |
| 225 | Isabella M. | 94116 |
| 226 | Alan W. | 94103 |
| 227 | Alessandra B. | 94122 |
| 228 | Brady J. | 94103 |
| 229 | Chase R. | 94117 |
| 230 | Allen D. | 94133 |
| 231 | Marie C. | 94117 |
| 232 | Samantha B. | 94131 |
| 233 | Arrigo B. | 94117 |
| 234 | Camila D. | 94117 |
| 235 | Lea W. | 94117 |
| 236 | Nicola S. | 94114 |
| 237 | Anonymous | 94133 |
| 238 | Catherine T. | 94102 |
| 239 | Michele F. | 94122 |
| 240 | Zak S. | 94102 |
| 241 | Emily S. | 94103 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lagunte, Richard (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 5 letters regarding zoning |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 25, 2025 10:00:11 AM |
| **Attachments:** | File Nos 250700, 250701, 250966.pdf |

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached for 5 letters regarding Zoning.

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
**Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-7709 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** agandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ader gandi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 21, 2025 11:40:05 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on a narrow russian hill alley called lynch.  This unchecked building boom is crazy. completely ruins the flavor os sf and legacy neighborhood. dont let this irreversible decision happen.

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
ader gandi
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 23, 2025 9:52:15 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan,born and raised here in North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My Italian Grandparents immigrated here to North Beach in 1898

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 24, 2025 12:00:45 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

**From:** selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 24, 2025 7:40:26 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,

San Francisco is already build out. Increasing density will be hard to to without evicting and displacing current tenants and small businesses and demolishing the buildings they already occupy -- including the one that I occupy. Therefore, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes this demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I am also an environmentalist, and I do not agree that evictions, displacement, and demolition are effective ways to protect the environment.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** lrb louisbiro.com
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Support for Tenant Protection Amendments in North Beach Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, November 24, 2025 8:34:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express our strong support for all amendments aimed at protecting tenants within the proposed family zoning plan.

As you consider the upzoning changes, it is crucial to prioritize the needs and rights of the current tenants in our community. North Beach is not just a neighborhood; it is a vibrant community rich in history and diversity. We believe that the amendments designed to safeguard tenant rights will enhance our neighborhood's resilience, ensuring that long-standing residents can continue to call North Beach home.

The proposed family zoning plan offers a promising opportunity for growth and development in our area, but this growth should not come at the expense of our community's residents. It is vital that we create an inclusive environment that respects the contributions of all who live here, particularly those who have built their lives in North Beach over the years.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and urge you to consider our support for these important amendments. Protecting tenants is essential for maintaining the character and culture of our beloved North Beach community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Louis Biro & Adrienne Biro Petrikovics

546 Filbert Street

San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** D M LaPointe
**Subject:** Re: Family Zoning - continue item
**Date:** Monday, November 24, 2025 12:00:01 PM
**Attachments:** Melgar - 11-24-25 response.docx

---

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

Thank you for responding. Please find attached a response outlining legitimate concerns from your constituents in your reply and requesting additional clarification and information.

Denise

On 2025-11-21 20:24, Melgar, Myrna (BOS) wrote:

> Dear Denise and Members of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council,
>
> Thank you for your letter. Please find my response attached.
>
> The next Committee hearing on the rezoning items will be on Monday, December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Myrna
>
> ---
>
> **From:** D M LaPointe <president@westoftwinpeaks.org>
> **Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 8:32 AM
> **To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
> **Cc:** Wtpcc Delegates <wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com>; Wtpcc Officers <wtpcc-officers@googlegroups.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>
> **Subject:** Family Zoning - continue item
>
> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
>
> Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.
>
> --
> Denise M. LaPointe
> President
> WTPCC

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 260
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfbos.org/melgar
**Sign up to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter**

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

**West of Twin Peaks Central Council**
*A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936*

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

November 24, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee

Supervisor Melgar,

Thank you for your response and for outlining your perspective as Chair of Land Use and Transportation on the Family Zoning Plan which was received after the close of business on November 21,2025. I appreciate the time you took to address several of the issues we raised. That said, there remain important points that deserve clarification if we are to maintain a constructive and transparent dialogue on a matter of such significant consequence to District 7 residents.

I do, however, want to better understand one particular line in your letter:

**"These goals are not mutually exclusive, but neither should be held hostage by the other."**

To be candid, this characterization is troubling. West of Twin Peaks Central Council (WTPCC) has raised substantive, good-faith concerns about the Family Zoning Plan's timing, implications, and state-law compliance to you, the Planning Department and the Mayor's office. Engaged neighborhood advocacy is not "hostage-taking," nor is it an attempt to obstruct the City's legal obligations. It is the core of civic participation - something I know you value. I would appreciate your clarification on why that framing was used and what, specifically, you believe our membership is "holding hostage."

Beyond that, several areas require further explanation if our member organizations are to fully understand the implications of the proposal:

First**,** while we understand the Charter deadlines that govern the General Plan Amendment, the community is seeking assurance that the accelerated timeline does not come at the expense of meaningful public review. The 90-day clock may be fixed, but thoughtful policymaking still requires engagement beyond procedural minimums - particularly on a zoning overhaul that will reshape long-established neighborhoods and our quality of life.

Second**,** you note that the City has been informed that density decontrol cannot be removed under current state compliance expectations. For many residents, this remains the most consequential component of the proposal. If this position is indeed immovable, we ask that your office clearly articulate what alternative adjustments are available to ensure predictability, impact mitigation, and neighborhood-appropriate outcomes across District 7.

Third, your letter references improvements the Board has made to the mayor's original legislation - including tenant protections, small business incentives, and safeguards for landmarks and historic buildings. We ask for a full summary of these amendments prior to December 1, 2025, so our member organizations can accurately understand their scope and effect.

While we recognize the legal framework imposed by state law, constituents expect their supervisor – our representative - to advocate for solutions that both comply with state requirements and reflect local conditions and impacts. West of Twin Peaks homeowners and residents want a zoning plan that achieves housing goals responsibly, without unforeseen consequences for infrastructure, public safety, schools, and neighborhood character. We believe these objectives are not only compatible but essential and achievable.

Our role is to represent the residents who will live with the consequences of these decisions. Your role is to ensure those concerns are fully considered, heard without dismissive language, and integrated into the City's policymaking rather than caricatured.

We remain willing partners in improving San Francisco's housing future. What we ask, respectfully, is that our concerns be met with the same seriousness and responsibility with which we bring them forward. We look forward to your clarification and to a continued dialogue rooted in mutual respect and accountability to the people of District 7.

Sincerely,
Denise LaPointe
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Board President, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
WTPCC Delegates and interested neighbors

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS) |
| **To:** | D M LaPointe; Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Farrah, Michael (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Re: Family Zoning - continue item |
| **Date:** | Friday, November 21, 2025 5:24:44 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Melgar Response to WTPCC - 11.20.2025.pdf |

---

Dear Denise and Members of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council,

Thank you for your letter. Please find my response attached.

The next Committee hearing on the rezoning items will be on Monday, December 1, 2025 at 1:30pm.

Sincerely,

Myrna

---

**From:** D M LaPointe <president@westoftwinpeaks.org>
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 8:32 AM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Wtpcc Delegates <wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com>; Wtpcc Officers <wtpcc-officers@googlegroups.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Family Zoning - continue item

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

Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 260
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfbos.org/melgar
**Sign up to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter**

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7

City and County of San Francisco

**MYRNA MELGAR**

November 20, 2025

Ms. Denise LaPointe
President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

**RE: Letter Responding to Family Zoning Plan Deadline and State Law**

Dear Ms. LaPointe,

I appreciate the time and effort you invested in outlining the concerns of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council. Your commitment to your neighborhoods is evident, and your voice is an important part of this conversation. That said, I need to be equally clear in my response.

The passage of the Family Zoning Plan cannot be delayed. The deadline is dictated by our own City and County Charter. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 90 days of receipt of the General Plan Amendment, which is part of the Zoning package, the General Plan Amendment will be deemed approved. It would be irresponsible for the Board to lapse on this timeframe. The vacancy of a member of the Board of Supervisors for District 4 created by the recall of the former District 4 representative can only be addressed by the Mayor, not the Board, but it cannot delay or stop the Board's work. We have a quorum, and the authority and responsibility to carry on our work. Additionally, I can assure you that former Supervisor Engardio did work on this plan extensively until he was recalled.

In addition, as you note in reference to recent communications from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), extensions are not being considered at this time. The City has been informed that removal of density decontrol is likewise not on the table under current state compliance expectations. We cannot operate under the assumption that delay or rollback is a viable strategy when the state has been explicit about its requirements.

I also recognize and share concerns about SB 79, which is why my office advocated for amendments to ensure that it did not impede our ability to pass a local plan. This exemption is critical and sets the framework moving forward. The Family Zoning Plan, inclusive of density decontrol, would provide the City the ability to submit a compliant alternative plan that exempts the City now and into the future. SB 79 requires that the alternative plan be resubmitted for approval by 2032.

San Francisco must move forward within the legal and regulatory framework we are given. The Board of Supervisors has greatly improved on the Mayor's original legislation: we have added protections for tenants, incorporated incentives for small businesses, larger family-sized units, transparency in the process, protection for landmarks and historic buildings, and made the plan more workable for each district.

I respect the long history and civic stewardship of the West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods. I also believe that San Francisco must grapple honestly with its housing and land use responsibilities. These goals are not mutually exclusive, but neither should be held hostage by the other.

Thank you again for your letter and for your continued engagement.

Sincerely,

Myrna Melgar
Supervisor, District 7
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689 • (415) 554-6516 Fax
(415) 554-6546 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 4 Letters regarding Zoning |
| **Date:** | Friday, November 21, 2025 11:39:18 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 4 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding Zoning.

**File No. 250966:** General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

**File No. 250700:** Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

**File No. 250701:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

**File No. 251072:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

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

**From:** Deanb182@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dean Badessa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 20, 2025 3:55:56 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dean Badessa
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, November 19, 2025 8:24:20 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning, not obvious trained obedience to the developer syndicate.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Heisler

**From:** debhowj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debra Leifer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 2:06:47 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I voted for Mayor Lurie and I am in favor of housing development. However, as both a long time resident of San Francisco, and someone who had a career of over 40 years in the architecture and design industry, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's current upzoning plan. To begin with - the proposed 8 story, 526 unit development over Safeway in my Outer Richmond neighborhood is totally out of scale with the neighborhood where the adjacent condo complexes are all just 3 stories high. Why not start building this 8 story, 526 unit at the abandoned Car wash site on Divisadero Street, which was slated for housing? Or, how about building these units at the Coronet Theatre and / or the Alexandria Theatre on Geary Blvd, both closed over 20 years ago and awaiting redevelopment? How about Park Merced where 4 towers were supposed to be built for additional housing?

It appears that Mayor Lurie's current upzoning plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and transforms our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Therefore, we call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Debra Leifer
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bob Fitch |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | demolition of rent controlled housing |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, November 19, 2025 9:27:24 AM |

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

Any Supervisor who votes for an "up zoning plan" that includes demolition of existing housing will face a recall. period.

Bob Fitch
North Beach

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 43 Letters regarding Zoning |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, November 19, 2025 12:10:50 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 43 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 43 letters regarding Zoning.

**File No. 250966:** General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

**File No. 250700:** Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

**File No. 251071:** Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

**File No. 250701:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

**File No. 251073:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

**File No. 251072:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | mel.e.simp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melinda Simpson |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 1:31:06 PM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Melinda Simpson
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** mary.lipian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Lipian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 1:30:27 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a long time resident in District 3 having lived there since 1997. This is the most highly concentrated area in the entire city and I'm concerned that the best interests of the residents are not being taken into account? How can that be?

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are magical and full of character. This is the Barbary Coast. Why would we want to change what is working so well? The 40 foot height limit needs to be protected to ensure this character.

I heard that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

I feel strongly that the Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary Lipian
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 1:25:01 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and renter in District 3, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing AFFORDABLE rent-controlled buildings, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable (and therefore vacant) luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps - JUST DO THE MINIMUM TO MEET STATE MANDATES FOR NOW!
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Limit new construction to 6 stories.
Save the Coastal Zone from this.
City land must be used only if the housing is 100% AFFORDABLE.
Do not densify so-called "transit corridors" until Muni can handle it. The 38 GEARY is already too crowded and unpleasant to ride, forcing people back into their cars.
The Mayor's Plan is TOO EXTREME and not focused on Affordability.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | shopdicke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Dicke |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 1:05:03 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan who cares deeply about our city growing in a thoughtful and intelligent way that preserves character, enhances affordability and supports small business.

Sincerely,
Leslie Dicke
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 1:01:47 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 1:01:18 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:36:21 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Paula Katz and I am a decades-long District 4 homeowner and resident without a supervisor to represent me and the rest of District 4. We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

It's critical that the Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands. These amendments are important, and SF residents should know how each of their representatives stand on these critical amendments. Hopefully by that time we'll have a new D4 supervisor, and we'll want to know how she/he stands on both of these amendments, which I and many other D4 residents support.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance. This is useful information for all supervisors, as they will not have studied the Mayor's proposals as closely as the Land Use Committee has. And the HD's information will be critical for helping to educate our new supervisor and bringing them up to speed on this issue.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 12:28:25 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:27:56 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:22:33 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** joanneshanahan135@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of joanne shanahan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 12:17:43 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

I am a 4th generation San Franciscan and was appalled when I heard that!  You need to hear from all of us especially those that live in the affected areas.  I realize the need for housing but what works for one neighborhood does not work for another.  Please listen to us!

Sincerely,
joanne shanahan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** rkinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Kay
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 12:16:20 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I honestly don't think that there's enough information available to the average San Franciscan. I can't tell by looking at maps, what my neighborhood will become. Please do more outreach! I haven't heard anything from my supervisor. thank you.

Sincerely,
Richard Kay
San Francisco, CA 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | awawd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ansel Wettersten |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:15:48 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Ansel Wettersten
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | naplisa123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Napoli |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:12:37 PM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Ann Napoli
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Garrity |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:12:26 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | familyadler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of B Adler |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:10:10 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My neighbors in the Sunset District are shocked to hear this lack of response and transparency!

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

We expect much better from our government.

Sincerely,
B Adler

**From:** shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 12:05:51 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anita Demas |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:05:44 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

This upzoning is causing clear and deserved outrage. The fact that there are attempts to circumvent and silence the voices of constituents is unacceptable. This is clearly an ill-thought out and devastatingly impactful plan. As a 35+ year resident, I am disgusted and disappointed that the beauty of SF is at stake and that lawmakers are pandering to developers and others. I vote and your choices will be noted.

Dr. Anita Demas

Sincerely,
Anita Demas
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** jamiespiral55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J Sheldon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 12:01:59 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: I was born in San Francisco over 70 years ago, and have lived in District 1 for nearly 27 years. I urge you to not let Supervisor Melgar to block your and Chen's amendments ASAP.

Sincerely,
J Sheldon

**From:** marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:43:38 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Prohibiting public opinion is the opposite of representing one's constituents. To forbid oversight & prevent citizens from determining the shape of the city we built, we live in, & we maintain is anti-democratic and the opposite of what supervisors are elected to do. Melgar needs to be reminded that her job is to represent constituents, not special interests, developers, or her own ambitions.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:33:46 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Lincoln Manor on Clement Street.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I am very concerned that full information come before the public at this meeting, in order to understand the full effects of the legislation.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | wrthoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Walter Thoma |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:33:37 AM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I have noticed an large increase in new multi-story housing complexes in my Excelsior neighborhood yet the infrastructure remains unchanged resulting in further congestion, poor law enforcement (we don't even have a police station) and lack of parking for residents and businesses. It's also unclear how many units are for lower income, elderly and working class San Franciscans. I personally believe that without analyzing the impact of increased housing on traffic, safety, public transit and quality of life issues, San Francisco will become an unlivable city for most outside of the wealthy class.

Sincerely,
Walter Thoma
San Francisco, CA 94112

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Paul Conroy |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | "Family Zoning Plan" |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 1:37:18 PM |
| **Attachments:** | To Supervisor Melgar re Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, representing your constituents and neighbors in Ingleside Terraces, again asks that you take steps to protect our neighborhood from the damage that will be inflicted by adoption of the "Family Zoning Plan" in its present form. This appeal follows on our August 29, 2025 letter to the mayor which we copied to you, setting forth a multitude of reasons why this unnecessary and destructive plan should be rejected. Our members have also provided public comment before your committee, expressing our strong concerns about this plan.

We reiterate those reasons, and further request that, if this plan is to be adopted, at a minimum: the amendments proposed to prevent demolition of sound housing and historic resources be adopted; density decontrol be removed; setbacks, height transitions and massing rules be preserved; forty-foot height limits be preserved for commercial corridors adjoining low scale residences; and historic resources, including category "A" structures, be preserved.

We also request that your committee postpone final consideration of this plan until our neighbors, the residents of District 4, have a new supervisor in place to represent their interests. We believe that every district should be represented by its own supervisor to advance the interests of that district's constituency. Certainly, the purpose of district elections is for communities within each district to be truly represented by a supervisor who has the best interests of their constituents at heart.

Very truly yours,
Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Lurie
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Website
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Neighborhoods United SF

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association
www.ithasf.org

Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

P.O. Box 27304 ● San Francisco, California 94127

November 17, 2025

The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Chair
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Via email

Re: "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, representing your constituents and neighbors in Ingleside Terraces, again asks that you take steps to protect our neighborhood from the damage that will be inflicted by adoption of the "Family Zoning Plan" in its present form. This appeal follows on our August 29, 2025 letter to the mayor which we copied to you, setting forth a multitude of reasons why this unnecessary and destructive plan should be rejected. Our members have also provided public comment before your committee, expressing our strong concerns about this plan.

We reiterate those reasons, and further request that, if this plan is to be adopted, at a minimum: the amendments proposed to prevent demolition of sound housing and historic resources be adopted; density decontrol be removed; setbacks, height transitions and massing rules be preserved; forty-foot height limits be preserved for commercial corridors adjoining low scale residences; and historic resources, including category "A" structures, be preserved.

We also request that your committee postpone final consideration of this plan until our neighbors, the residents of District 4, have a new supervisor in place to represent their interests. We believe that every district should be represented by its own supervisor to advance the interests of that district's constituency. Certainly, the purpose of district elections is for communities within each district to be truly represented by a supervisor who has the best interests of their constituents at heart.

Very truly yours,

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Website
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
Neighborhoods United SF

**From:** robert.stern47@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Stern
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:45:13 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I also wanted to note that I'm a Sunset District resident, and these issues directly affect my neighborhood and my ability to remain in my home.

Sincerely,
Robert Stern
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** ajsmith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Artemis Smith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:53 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I also wanted to note that I'm a Sunset District resident, and these issues directly affect my neighborhood and my ability to remain in my home.

Sincerely,
Artemis Smith
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:38:30 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: Upzoning should be about affordable housing and little else. And squeezing out public input on such a massively important issue is wildly unfair. Let Chan and Chen's amendments advance!

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | antispila@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Candace Low |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:35:53 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Candace Low
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** sf_district6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Nulty
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:24:31 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Zoning can be done in phases and not all at once, for some reason the politicians are giving away the keys to the city!

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Clark
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:23:20 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident in the West Portal area.
I reject any idea of buildings more 4 stories.
It is unnecessary to have huge high rise buildings in residential areas.
High rises belong downtown.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's up zoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required.
This is not planning.

Sincerely,
Carol Clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:19:32 PM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | clarable@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claire Mills |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 1:43:04 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Our city is our city and we all should be a part of this public process!

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountability.

Sincerely,
Claire Mills
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Devon Bolla |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Ryan Patterson; Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss |
| **Subject:** | Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:12 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf |

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

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
*(she/her)*
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Ryan Patterson |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss; Devon Bolla |
| **Subject:** | RE: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:58:40 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf |

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

Further to the below email, can you please kindly add the attachment to the above-captioned files?

Thank you very much,

Ryan J. Patterson
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Main: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7701
Mobile: (530) 913-7609
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
ryan@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

---

**From:** Devon Bolla <devon@pattersononeill.com>
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:43 PM
**To:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
**Cc:** Ryan Patterson <ryan@pattersononeill.com>; Ephraim Margolin <emargolin@pattersononeill.com>; Sonja Trauss <sonja@yimbylaw.org>
**Subject:** Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing

element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
*(she/her)*
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

# PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

***VIA EMAIL***

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

## I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

### A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

### B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

### C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

## II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

## III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

### A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

*for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

### B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

## IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

## V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

## VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

# EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

**Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law**

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

**Summary**

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

**Capacity Projections**

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5.  applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

**Compliance with State Law**

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

**Conclusion**

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

**Jack Farrell, Esq.**
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

# EXHIBIT B

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jane Natoli |
| **To:** | paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf |

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

**Jane Natoli (she/her)**
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

**Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development**
**Mayor Daniel Lurie**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)**
*October 29, 2025*

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

**Salim Damerdji**

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

**Jane Natoli**

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

## Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

**"Soft Sites Method"**

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

**“Citywide Capacity Method”**

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

**"Financial Feasibility Method"**

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

# EXHIBIT C

# Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

# Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

# Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

# Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

# Details of the Rezoning




The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

# The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

# Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

# Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

# Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

# Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

# Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

# Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

# San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

# Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

# High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

# Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios




Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

# Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

| Planning District | Historic, 2000-24 | Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 | High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Buena Vista | 975 | 43 | 90 |
| Central | 72 | 192 | 390 |
| Downtown | 289 | 112 | 230 |
| Ingleside | 0 | 58 | 120 |
| Inner Sunset | 123 | 28 | 59 |
| Marina | 131 | 126 | 263 |
| Mission | 187 | 197 | 406 |
| Northeast | 449 | 136 | 283 |
| Outer Sunset | 15 | 16 | 33 |
| Richmond | 0 | 23 | 47 |
| South Central | 0 | 6 | 11 |
| Western Addition | 997 | 658 | 1,265 |
| Total | 3,238 | 1,594 | 3,199 |

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

# Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

| **Low Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 1,594 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 10,098 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 8,504 |

| **High Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 3,199 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 17,845 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 14,646 |

# Summary by Current Zoning District

| | | Low-Growth | | | High-Growth | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current Zoning[3] | Number of Parcels | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units |
| RH1 | 43,009 | 0.001% | 0.205% | 798 | 0.003% | 0.446% | 1,731 |
| RH2 | 26,486 | 0.002% | 0.259% | 576 | 0.005% | 0.565% | 1,250 |
| RH3_RM1 | 13,741 | 0.009% | 0.347% | 547 | 0.018% | 0.756% | 1,186 |
| Office/Commercial | 114 | 0.570% | 0.780% | 48 | 1.185% | 1.639% | 104 |
| Public | 239 | 0.060% | 1.450% | 3,483 | 0.122% | 2.560% | 4,814 |
| Density-Restricted Multifamily | 7,079 | 0.336% | 0.490% | 3,007 | 0.674% | 1.026% | 5,467 |
| Form-Based Multifamily | 2,053 | 0.725% | 0.725% | 46 | 1.502% | 1.502% | 94 |
| Total | 92,721 | | | 8,504 | | | 14,646 |

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

# Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

# Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

| | **Low Growth Scenario** | **High Growth Scenario** |
|---|---|---|
| Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions) | 8,041 | 13,615 |
| Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5] | 2.0% | 3.4% |
| Price Elasticity of Demand | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| Price Elasticity of Supply | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Percent change in housing prices | -2.5% | -4.2% |
| Corresponding change in condo prices[6] | -$24,500 | -$41,600 |
| Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7] | -$903 | -$1,529 |

# Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

| | Low Growth | High Growth |
|---|---:|---:|
| Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf) | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Disruption-relocation cost/sf | $190 | $190 |
| Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million) | $16 | $28 |

# REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

# Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

# Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

# Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

# Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

| Variable Description | Variable | Data Source |
|---|---|---|
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior | Construc_Cost_Real | a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100 |
| 10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior | Zillow_Price_Real | SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100 |
| Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | Calculated from Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space | zp_Public | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Planning District dummy variables | DIST_<District Name> | Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | Intercept | (1.6226) | 1.2829 | 1.5998 | 0.2059 |
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | 0.0017 | 0.0007 | 4.9693 | 0.0258 |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | 0.0049 | 0.0009 | 30.6563 | 0.0000 |
| Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 5.0369 | 0.0248 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | (0.0023) | 0.0007 | 10.7241 | 0.0011 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | (0.8231) | 0.1222 | 45.3669 | 0.0000 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | (1.0378) | 0.1271 | 66.6847 | 0.0000 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable | Construc_Cost_Real | (0.0992) | 0.0129 | 58.8929 | 0.0000 |
| SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real | Zillow_Price_Real | 0.0143 | 0.0053 | 7.1326 | 0.0076 |
| Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | 0.6303 | 0.1608 | 15.3724 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | 4.2634 | 0.4873 | 76.5337 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | 4.2450 | 0.4523 | 88.0989 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | 5.0508 | 0.4640 | 118.4768 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | 3.4115 | 0.4790 | 50.7257 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Public/Open Space | zp_Public | 1.2491 | 0.8385 | 2.2190 | 0.1363 |
| Zoning = Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | 4.5361 | 0.4999 | 82.3213 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | 0.2674 | 0.6672 | 0.1607 | 0.6885 |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | 1.3187 | 0.6064 | 4.7289 | 0.0297 |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District = South Bayshore | DIST_SBayshore | (1.4824) | 0.3179 | 21.7380 | 0.0000 |
| District = Bernal Heights | DIST_BernalHts | (1.7011) | 0.6087 | 7.8100 | 0.0052 |
| District = South Central | DIST_Scentral | (1.7307) | 0.3867 | 20.0267 | 0.0000 |
| District = Central | DIST_Central | (1.1523) | 0.3353 | 11.8102 | 0.0006 |
| District = Buena Vista | DIST_BuenaVista | (2.5369) | 1.0188 | 6.2010 | 0.0128 |
| District = Northeast | DIST_Northeast | (1.4171) | 0.2539 | 31.1439 | 0.0000 |
| District = Western Addition | DIST_WestAddition | (0.6831) | 0.2362 | 8.3630 | 0.0038 |
| District = South of Market | DIST_SOMA | (0.0756) | 0.1903 | 0.1579 | 0.6911 |
| District = Inner Sunset | DIST_InnerSunset | (1.6187) | 0.4882 | 10.9939 | 0.0009 |
| District = Richmond | DIST_Richmond | (2.8019) | 0.5355 | 27.3716 | 0.0000 |
| District = Ingleside | DIST_Ingleside | (1.8670) | 0.4925 | 14.3711 | 0.0002 |
| District = Outer Sunset | DIST_OuterSunset | (2.6147) | 0.6098 | 18.3867 | 0.0000 |
| District = Marina | DIST_Marina | (1.2492) | 0.3253 | 14.7457 | 0.0001 |
| District = Mission | DIST_Mission | (1.0938) | 0.2380 | 21.1176 | 0.0000 |

*Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:*

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

# Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | St Error | T-Stat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.4252 | 0.0159 | 26.72 |
| State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward) | SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull | 0.4385 | 0.0389 | 11.28 |
| Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted | Zoning_DR_EnvFull | (0.1601) | 0.0174 | (9.22) |

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

# Appendix: Model Performance

| **Logistic Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 3,369,573 |
| Number with Dependent Variable = 1 | 422 |
| Pseudo R-Square | 0.000611 |
| Max Rescaled R-Square | 0.244596 |

| **Units Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 383 |
| R-Sq | 0.867779 |
| Adj R-Sq | 0.866735 |
| Dependent Mean Value | 81.87206 |
| Standard Error of Regression | 48.40184 |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_RH1 | C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1 |
| zp_RH2 | NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2 |
| zp_RH3_RM1 | RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO |
| zp_OfficeComm | C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_DRMulti_RTO | NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_Public | C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public |
| zp_FBDMulti_RTO | DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG |
| zp_PDRInd | DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2 |
| zp_Redev | HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL |

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

# Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

# Staff Contact

**Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist** ted.egan@sfgov.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bobak Esfandiari |
| **Cc:** | Mike Chen |
| **Subject:** | SF Democratic Party"s Resolution in support of the Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 3:00:25 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Resolution In Support of the Family Zoning Plan to Make Housing More Affordable And Preserve Local Control_Combined.pdf |

---

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

To all interested parties,

On October 22, 2025 the San Francisco Democratic Party passed a resolution supporting the Family Zoning Plan to Make Housing More Affordable And Preserve Local Control.

The resolution was passed with a vote of 21 AYEs, by the members present and was introduced by Michael Chen and Nancy Tung.

A certificate detailing the vote count is included on the attached PDF which includes the resolution.

If you have further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to myself or the author, who is copied on this email.

Best,
Bobak Esfandiari

--
*Bobak Esfandiari*
*Executive Director, San Francisco Democratic Party*
*bobak@sfdems.org | +1.925.899.2409 he/him*

SF DEMS
SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Date Passed: October 22, 2025

Resolution Number: 2025-10-Family Zoning

Aye: 21 – Akbar, Arce, Calamuci, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Dorsey, Gupta, Hare, Ho, Kingsbury, Lai, Mahmood, Philhour, Sangirardi, Tung, Ma, Cohen, Wiener, Haney, Stefani

Nay: 5 – Avalos, Chan, Gallotta, Mar, Mullin

Abstain: 3 – Tu, Pelosi, Kounalakis

Absent: 3 – Alioto-Pier, Kim, Nguyen

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 22, 2025 by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Bobak Esfandiari

Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director


**SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

OFFICERS
Nancy Tung, Chair
Dan Calamuci, First Vice Chair
Marjan Philhour, Second Vice Chair
Cedric Akbar, Third Vice Chair
Emma Hare, Fourth Vice Chair
Michael Lai, Finance Director
Mike Chen, Internal Operations Director
Lanier Coles, External Operations Director

MEMBERS
Michela Alioto-Pier
Joshua Arce
John Avalos
Connie Chan
Trevor Chandler
Matt Dorsey
Peter Gallotta
Parag Gupta
Lily Ho
Jane Kim
Eric Kingsbury
Bilal Mahmood
Gordon Mar
Michael Nguyen
Joe Sangirardi
Jade Tu

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
U.S. Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi
U.S. Congressmember Kevin Mullin
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
State Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Malia Cohen
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember Matt Haney
State Assemblymember Catherine Stefani

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Bobak Esfandiari



San Francisco Democratic Party
1390 Market Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 226-9771
info@sfdems.org
www.sfdems.org

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE AND PRESERVE LOCAL CONTROL**

**Principal Authors:** Mike Chen, Nancy Tung
**Co-Sponsors:** Cedric Akbar, Joshua Arce, Dan Calamuci, Trevor Chandler, Lanier Coles, Matt Dorsey, Parag Gupta, Eric Kingsbury, Michael Lai, Bilal Mahmood, Marjan Philhour, Joe Sangirardi

**WHEREAS,** San Francisco's decades-long housing shortage has caused housing prices to explode; high housing costs are a burden on San Franciscans and contribute to the homelessness, displacement, and cost of living crises; and San Francisco must proactively address rising housing costs in order to retain and attract workers, artists, innovators, and young people to live here; and

**WHEREAS**, California law requires cities and counties to plan for more housing to meet population growth; to comply with state law, in 2023, after outreach and neighborhood input, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a plan to allow 82,069 new homes at varying income affordability levels by 2031;[1] the plan commits San Francisco to a rezoning program to allow more homes to be created; and

**WHEREAS,** If the city fails to follow through on the plan and rezone, the city will go back on its commitments to the state, leading to court penalties, the loss of over $100 million every year in state funds for transportation and low-income housing, and loss of local land use authority through a state takeover that nullifies all local planning standards around height, setbacks, design, density, parking, and shadows through the Builder's Remedy; without a rezoning plan, San Francisco will continue to become more expensive, less racially diverse, and less welcoming to working families, young people, seniors, and immigrants, while losing the ability to plan responsibly; and

[1] Board File #230001, Housing Element https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5982213&GUID=A8FDFF26-50BF-4031-9A36-D58ECD208048

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

**WHEREAS**, the proposed Family Zoning Plan for San Francisco (a) focuses more housing capacity along transit and commercial corridors where more housing makes the most sense; (b) would facilitate low-income housing in priority equity neighborhoods such as the Mission, Chinatown or South of Market; (c) would generate funding and expand opportunities for low- and middle-income housing built by community-based non-profit organizations, including (but not limited to) drug-free housing for people recovering from substance use disorder; (d) incentivizes construction of family-sized homes with at least two bedrooms; (e) includes strategies to prevent small business displacement; (f) complements state housing laws and labor standards that promote union construction jobs and lift up working conditions and standards for all residential construction workers; (g) ensures that low-income affordable housing is preserved or replaced, and that tenants can return there after construction; (h) allows the creation of new rent-controlled housing; and

**WHEREAS,** the Family Zoning Plan will also build on existing and developing policies to stabilize families and communities, including the inclusionary housing program for generating affordable housing for low-income workers and immigrant families, the neighborhood preference program to keep vulnerable low-income families in their own neighborhoods and the city, demolition controls to preserve tenant-occupied and guard against the destruction and loss of rent-controlled housing, rent control, tenant eviction protections, and fully-funded small business assistance and relocation programs; and therefore

**RESOLVED**, that the San Francisco Democratic Party supports the Family Zoning Plan with the aforementioned goals and principles, which preserves local control, complies with the state-mandated Housing Element, makes housing more affordable, supports union construction jobs with high labor standards, advances recovery from addiction, and protects tenants and small businesses from displacement; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Mayor Daniel Lurie and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; and that the San Francisco Democratic Party directs the Executive Director to support the Family Zoning Plan.

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lee Heidhues |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Luke Bornheimer; Lucas Lux; DPH-jodie; Robin at KidSafe SF; Andy Thornley; Chan, Connie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Joe Eskenazi; Joe Fitzgerald; rswan@sfchronicle.com; Garcia-Ruiz, Emilio; Ms. Lizzie Ann Heidhues |
| **Subject:** | Fwd: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled? |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 18, 2025 5:50:25 PM |

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

Mayor Lurie

https://newspack-missionlocal.s3.amazonaws.com/mission/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/D4-Questionnaire-Final.pdf

The questionnaire has an implicit bias in that it asks how the respondent voted on Proposition Kpp and refers to "Great Highway" even though the proper name is Sunset Dunes Park
Given that you, Mayor Lurie, are opposed to the Park the phrasing of the question lays bare your bias.
A proponent of Proposition K will never be appointed

**In Solidarity,**
**Lee Heidhues**

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Lee Heidhues** <leerossh@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 18, 2025, 5:33 PM
Subject: Fwd: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
To: Barish Jean <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>

Jean

Thought you might like to see this

**In Solidarity,**
**Lee**

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mission Local** <info@missionlocal.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 18, 2025, 5:31 PM
Subject: Upzoning plan amendments: What got stalled?
To: <leerossh@gmail.com>

mission-local-logo

Good afternoon!

**Want to be D4 supervisor**? Mission Local obtained the 5-page questionnaire the **Mayor's office** is sending out to applicants. In an only-in-San Francisco touch, applicants were asked whether they'd ever hired a **permit expediter** on their properties.

The Land Use committee of the S.F. Board of Supervisors approved a few state-supported **amendments to the city's controversial upzoning plan**, and tabled more sweeping attempts to **exempt** certain areas from development. **Io Yeh Gilman** explains what's happening—and what's next.

The legacy business **Bissap Baobab** is closing its Mission Street venue after **28 years.** The owner, **Marco Senghor**, is actively looking for a new location, and promises a **farewell party** for the neighborhood December 20.

For the **back story**, read about Senghor's previous move from '**Little Baobab**' to 'Big Baobab.'

More soon,

Sara

---

## Latest News



### Sweeping amendments to S.F. upzoning plan tabled

"We cannot simply agree to demolish San Francisco for the sake of meeting a state mandate."

## Want to be D4 supervisor? Here's the mayor’s questionnaire.

"Have you ever said anything that could be perceived as offensive on social media platforms such as X?"

## Bissap Baobab to close Mission St. location

"Let us be clear: Baobab is NOT done. The Baobab bends, but it never breaks."

## Back Story



### ‘Big Baobab’ to plant fresh roots on Mission Street

"I feel like Baobab is not mine anymore; it belongs to the community."

## SNAP

Viva KitKat

By Elina Davenport

---

# Events

## All Events

**Today:** Wendy DeWitt, Queen of Boogie Woogie at the Woodchopper's Ball, Verdi Club, November 18, 9-11:30PM

**Tomorrow**: Public Board Meeting at the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, November 19, 6-8PM

---


**We have $76,500 in matching funds!**

One gift, twice the impact. Donate today to keep Mission Local **forever free — for everyone.**

**I'm in! Match my gift.**

This email was sent to leerossh@gmail.com
*why did I get this?* unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences
Mission Local · 2489 Mission St Ste 22 · San Francisco, CA 94110-2473 · USA

**From:** hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, November 18, 2025 1:44:18 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** young.erika@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Young
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:47:24 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

What on earth is happening to City Hall? Do Scott Wiener and his YIMBY overlords decide everything now? The Land Use Committee just voted to kill Supervisor Chan and Chen's amendments to Mayor Lurie's “Rich Family Housing Plan”. This means that Daniel Lurie deliberately created a housing plan that would drive his own residents and small businesses out of the city.

I can only assume that greed and money are driving Senator Wiener and Supervisor Melgar, because I can't find a way to explain their actions with logic. I also find it shameful that Wiener would come to the city of San Francisco and make it his home -- a city that ensures his personal freedom as a gay man -- and then turn around and do everything he can to destroy it.

Regarding Supervisor Melgar, I've seen news coverage that the residents of D7 are starting to consider a recall. I've also seen quotes from constituents who really used to like her, and now can't understand why she literally ignores them.

A lot of city residents have been asking how something like Redevelopment could have happened. Now we know.

Sincerely,
Erika Young
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** jennifer_mahoney@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jennifer mahoney
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 4:55:16 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Lincoln Manor neighborhoods parking is a big problem because there are not any parking permits here-all the apartment residents on Geary and Clement use our street (shore view) as a parking lot!! Because there isn't any enforcement, it's a real nuisance for ppl who live here It cannot get any worse.

Sincerely,
jennifer mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 4:32:28 PM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. The proposed zoning changes are the most far reaching in decades and should not be rushed through behind closed doors.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | kielykids@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaVive Kiely |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 4:05:40 PM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

What are you tying to hide from us?

Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** betho9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth O Kellenberger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 3:21:30 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

THIS PLAN jumps the gun. Poorly considered. We don't even really know how much vacant housing there is because that's "hard to determine" in S.F. Meanwhile, owners don't want to rent because they can't get bad tenants out. LET'S FIX THAT FIRST. Also , we don't have public transit built for NORTH/SoUTH travel by car OR by public transit…. Especially now that great highway is closed….. SO LET'S FIX THAT first.

Sincerely,
Beth O Kellenberger
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 3:07:51 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 3:06:25 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: Do what the people who elected you want, not what you want.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

SF DEMS
SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Date Passed: October 22, 2025

Resolution Number: 2025-10-Family Zoning

Aye: 21 – Akbar, Arce, Calamuci, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Dorsey, Gupta, Hare, Ho, Kingsbury, Lai, Mahmood, Philhour, Sangirardi, Tung, Ma, Cohen, Wiener, Haney, Stefani

Nay: 5 – Avalos, Chan, Gallotta, Mar, Mullin

Abstain: 3 – Tu, Pelosi, Kounalakis

Absent: 3 – Alioto-Pier, Kim, Nguyen

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 22, 2025 by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Bobak Esfandiari

Bobak Esfandiari
Executive Director


**SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

OFFICERS
Nancy Tung, Chair
Dan Calamuci, First Vice Chair
Marjan Philhour, Second Vice Chair
Cedric Akbar, Third Vice Chair
Emma Hare, Fourth Vice Chair
Michael Lai, Finance Director
Mike Chen, Internal Operations Director
Lanier Coles, External Operations Director

MEMBERS
Michela Alioto-Pier
Joshua Arce
John Avalos
Connie Chan
Trevor Chandler
Matt Dorsey
Peter Gallotta
Parag Gupta
Lily Ho
Jane Kim
Eric Kingsbury
Bilal Mahmood
Gordon Mar
Michael Nguyen
Joe Sangirardi
Jade Tu

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
U.S. Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi
U.S. Congressmember Kevin Mullin
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
State Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Malia Cohen
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember Matt Haney
State Assemblymember Catherine Stefani

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Bobak Esfandiari



San Francisco Democratic Party
1390 Market Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 226-9771
info@sfdems.org
www.sfdems.org

# RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE AND PRESERVE LOCAL CONTROL

**Principal Authors:** Mike Chen, Nancy Tung
**Co-Sponsors:** Cedric Akbar, Joshua Arce, Dan Calamuci, Trevor Chandler, Lanier Coles, Matt Dorsey, Parag Gupta, Eric Kingsbury, Michael Lai, Bilal Mahmood, Marjan Philhour, Joe Sangirardi

**WHEREAS,** San Francisco's decades-long housing shortage has caused housing prices to explode; high housing costs are a burden on San Franciscans and contribute to the homelessness, displacement, and cost of living crises; and San Francisco must proactively address rising housing costs in order to retain and attract workers, artists, innovators, and young people to live here; and

**WHEREAS**, California law requires cities and counties to plan for more housing to meet population growth; to comply with state law, in 2023, after outreach and neighborhood input, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a plan to allow 82,069 new homes at varying income affordability levels by 2031;[1] the plan commits San Francisco to a rezoning program to allow more homes to be created; and

**WHEREAS,** If the city fails to follow through on the plan and rezone, the city will go back on its commitments to the state, leading to court penalties, the loss of over $100 million every year in state funds for transportation and low-income housing, and loss of local land use authority through a state takeover that nullifies all local planning standards around height, setbacks, design, density, parking, and shadows through the Builder's Remedy; without a rezoning plan, San Francisco will continue to become more expensive, less racially diverse, and less welcoming to working families, young people, seniors, and immigrants, while losing the ability to plan responsibly; and

---

[1] Board File #230001, Housing Element https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5982213&GUID=A8FDFF26-50BF-4031-9A36-D58ECD208048

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

**WHEREAS**, the proposed Family Zoning Plan for San Francisco (a) focuses more housing capacity along transit and commercial corridors where more housing makes the most sense; (b) would facilitate low-income housing in priority equity neighborhoods such as the Mission, Chinatown or South of Market; (c) would generate funding and expand opportunities for low- and middle-income housing built by community-based non-profit organizations, including (but not limited to) drug-free housing for people recovering from substance use disorder; (d) incentivizes construction of family-sized homes with at least two bedrooms; (e) includes strategies to prevent small business displacement; (f) complements state housing laws and labor standards that promote union construction jobs and lift up working conditions and standards for all residential construction workers; (g) ensures that low-income affordable housing is preserved or replaced, and that tenants can return there after construction; (h) allows the creation of new rent-controlled housing; and

**WHEREAS,** the Family Zoning Plan will also build on existing and developing policies to stabilize families and communities, including the inclusionary housing program for generating affordable housing for low-income workers and immigrant families, the neighborhood preference program to keep vulnerable low-income families in their own neighborhoods and the city, demolition controls to preserve tenant-occupied and guard against the destruction and loss of rent-controlled housing, rent control, tenant eviction protections, and fully-funded small business assistance and relocation programs; and therefore

**RESOLVED**, that the San Francisco Democratic Party supports the Family Zoning Plan with the aforementioned goals and principles, which preserves local control, complies with the state-mandated Housing Element, makes housing more affordable, supports union construction jobs with high labor standards, advances recovery from addiction, and protects tenants and small businesses from displacement; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Mayor Daniel Lurie and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; and that the San Francisco Democratic Party directs the Executive Director to support the Family Zoning Plan.

PROPOUNDED BY: Chen, Tung
ADOPTED: 10-22-2025
RESOLUTION NO. 2025-10-Family Zoning

Public Comment to the Land Use Committee 11/17/2025
Jessica Vistnes

My name is Jessica Vistnes and I am a resident of District 2. I've given public comment several times before and was thinking about not coming again today but I feel so strongly about this issue that here I am. I have a lot of concerns about the upzoning in District 2, but in my 2 minutes I want to concentrate on the upzoning to 14 stories on Lombard Street from Laguna going east to Van Ness.

My understanding of how this came about was that it was in response to a proposal from the Cow Hollow Association. I am attaching a copy of that proposal with my comments today and I am hoping you will read it. The proposal had asked to taper the increase of heights on Lombard so that there would be no increase from four stories around the Palace of Fine Arts up through Webster Street so people could see the Palace of Fine Arts. Then the proposal called for increasing heights to five stories from Webster to Gough and then six stories between Gough and Van Ness. This proposal seemed very reasonable to me and fits with the scale of the neighborhood.

My understanding was that in response to this proposal heights WERE lowered close to the Palace of Fine Arts – in line with neighborhood concerns. But heights were not lowered to five stories on the next part of Lombard and instead of heights of six stories closer to Van Ness they were increased from what had been in the plan before to now be 14 stories. And my further understanding is this was done to maintain the count along Lombard Street – which is, in my opinion, not a thoughtful way to do planning.

This part of San Francisco has many of the views of the Bay that are iconic. These blocks on Lombard would affect views of Fort Mason and Alcatraz from many viewpoints. So, I am here again to ask you to put in an amendment to lower the heights from 14 stories on the blocks from Laguna to Van Ness. If the heights were so easily increased from maps that had been in the works for years, they should be able to be decreased although time is getting very short.

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147

April 30, 2025

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Re: Proposed Revisions to the Upzoning Map to Reflect District 2's Community Planning, Safety, and Growth Objectives**

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

Thank you for your engagement with our neighborhood as we collectively work toward a vision of housing growth that respects San Francisco's history, diverse communities, scale, and distinctive public spaces.

As SF Planning continues to revise the proposed Upzoning Map, we request a series of specific, actionable changes critical to maintaining the identity, livability, and uniqueness of this part of San Francisco. We look forward to working with you to:

- Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco
- Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety
- Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors
- Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

This part of District 2 features some of San Francisco's most iconic landmarks—from the Bay and the Palace of Fine Arts to the Golden Gate Bridge. As drivers enter the city via the Presidio Parkway, they experience a rare blend of hillside housing and urban density, evoking the charm of Europe's great coastal cities. The combination of natural setting, architectural rhythm, and cultural legacy makes this area both a world-class tourist destination and a cherished residential neighborhood.

For over a century, development west of Van Ness has followed the city's natural topography, integrating the urban grid with the land's slope, sunlight, and airflow. This is no accident—it is the result of organic, community-guided planning. Taller buildings crown the hilltops, gradually stepping down to 40 feet as the land slopes toward the Bay. Where this balance has been ignored, the consequences have been damaging.

As the city updates its zoning map to meet housing goals, it has both the opportunity and the obligation to respect this historic, context-sensitive development pattern. A one-size-fits-all approach invites speculative land grabs, drives up land costs, and risks replacing community-serving homes and businesses with unaffordable, investor-driven development.

## Requested Map Changes & Policy Adjustments

### 1. Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco

Lombard Street forms a gateway into San Francisco from the Golden Gate Bridge, framing iconic landmarks like the Palace of Fine Arts. Longstanding planning principles recognize that such landmarks must retain their visual prominence within the surrounding cityscape.

The proposed Upzoning Map undermines those principles by allowing buildings 6 to 8 stories tall—or more—immediately adjacent to or within the vicinity of lower-scale blocks and historic landmarks. These oversized structures, up to 100% larger than their surroundings, would crowd and compete with iconic features like the Palace of Fine Arts—a City Landmark that has long defined San Francisco's northern waterfront. Its visual stature depends on a built environment that respects both scale and setting. A blunt, uniform upzoning to 85 feet disregards topography and erodes the historic character that makes this area both livable and globally recognized.

We recommend a tapered height approach: 40 feet near the Palace, rising gradually to 50 and then 65 feet approaching Van Ness. This reflects the area's historical development pattern and ensures a balanced transition from the waterfront to the city's interior.

**Recommended Height Limits:**

- Limit building height to 40' on Richardson Avenue and on Lombard Street (starting at the Lombard Gate) to Webster Street
- Allow gradual increases beyond Webster to Van Ness:
    - 50' between Webster and Gough
    - 65' between Gough and Van Ness

This part of San Francisco — including Cow Hollow, the Marina, and Pacific Heights — has been assigned thousands of new units of housing capacity through broad density decontrol and increased height allowances, all contributing to the state's RHNA targets. It is more than our fair share in one of the city's most densely populated neighborhoods. These policies, when done properly, could enable new growth by allowing duplexes, triplexes, and small multi-unit buildings across the neighborhood.

In addition, Lombard is home to many small, independent motels dating back to the era of the Golden Gate Bridge — a rare remnant of San Francisco's history of welcoming visitors within neighborhood settings. Lombard is one of the last Motorways in the country that captures that hope-filled era of travel in mid-century America, rebuilding after World War II. These motels provide reasonably priced rooms and proximity to a major tourist destination, and support for our local businesses. Several of these motels have already been converted to student housing for the Academy of Art University. Losing others will result in losing tourism to our community and neighborhoods.

These recommendations align with the Planning Department's stated goals under the General Plan to preserve neighborhood character, maintain economic diversity, and enhance citywide view corridors.

## 2. Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety

Lombard Street already has many residents living in rent-controlled apartments. These homes are essential to neighborhood stability and affordability, and support a vibrant mix of retail, services, and housing. Let's ensure long-time tenants in older rent-controlled buildings will not be quietly displaced through buyouts and demolitions.

As the upzoning plans allowed for more residents, we need to ensure the safety of those residents. The Planning Department must consider the serious risk of liquefaction in these areas. Much of the low-lying Marina and Cow Hollow was built on infill and remains vulnerable to seismic activity.

Aside from Lombard being a liquefaction zone, fire response time is a consideration. Cow Hollow boasts a newly rebuilt fire station on Greenwich Street. However, the fire truck ladders at this station can only service buildings as tall as 6-7 stories. If the building heights nearby are raised to 85' or taller, trucks must come from other neighborhoods, increasing the response time and endangering residents and visitors. This public safety issue has not been addressed anywhere in the city where buildings are proposed for drastic height increases.

These issues point to the need for thoughtful major corridor plans along not only Lombard, but Geary, 19th, and Taraval, among others, to ensure that urban planning practices can be implemented with the public input and care that went into the Market-Octavia or Central SOMA Plans of recent years.

## 3. Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors

Chestnut, Union, and Fillmore streets are economic and cultural anchors. Their small-scale, sunlit retail corridors support thousands of jobs and contribute significantly to neighborhood livability and a large contingent of the city's 20+ million visitors that further contribute to supporting local employment and small businesses.

Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition—many of these buildings are historic one-story Art Deco structures that currently house thriving small businesses. These businesses will not survive the transition, and adjacent shops are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize entire commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life that make these neighborhoods work.

The Marina Safeway site is another concern. While redevelopment may be considered, its location and current use are vital for residents—especially seniors and families without access to private transportation. A high-rise would be inappropriate and disruptive in this context.

**Recommended Height Limits:**

- Limit height to 40 feet on:
    - Union Street
    - Chestnut Street
    - Lower Fillmore Street (within the Marina and Cow Hollow)
    - Upper Fillmore Street (from Jackson to Bush)
    - Safeway site (corner of Laguna and Marina Blvd)

## 4. Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

To promote transparency and encourage meaningful neighborhood engagement, urge SF Planning to update the current interactive Upzoning Map to clearly reflect the two key provisions. Most San Franciscans are unfamiliar with these kinds of online tools and may not realize they need to click the "Info" button in the left-hand legend to uncover the proposed changes.

Currently, if someone clicks on a corner lot within the density decontrol area, the map still shows a proposed height of 40 feet—rather than the actual 65 feet being contemplated. This creates confusion and obscures the true scope of the changes. Failure to make these provisions plainly visible may not meet the standards of procedural transparency or informed public review expected under CEQA and other land use statutes. Complete clarity is essential.

But clarity alone is not enough. These provisions are deeply flawed and should be removed:

**Recommended Changes:**

- **Remove the provision that allows 65' heights on corners lots.** This will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision.
- **Remove the provision that allows lots 8,000 sq. ft. or greater to automatically rise to 65'.** This provision encourages lot mergers that will invade the unique and vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in dense urban living.

## Conclusion

We support new housing through thoughtful, context-sensitive growth. Like the city, we believe in expanding housing opportunities through planning that respects topography, preserves neighborhood identity, and safeguards essential services.

This area has already added housing capacity through the 4- and 6-plex legislation led by Supervisor Mandelman and adopted in 2023. We welcome further improvements that recognize Lombard Street's role as a scenic gateway.

But the current map goes too far. It invites speculation, drives up land costs, and encourages the demolition of sound housing—quietly displacing tenants and small businesses in favor of unaffordable luxury towers. These are the very people and places that give our neighborhoods their life and character.

Incorporating the revisions we've outlined will build public trust, reflect sound planning, and reduce the risk of unnecessary conflict or delay.

We urge you to support a smarter, long-term strategy—one that protects what makes San Francisco unique: its layered history, diverse communities, small businesses, and walkable, human-scale neighborhoods that reflect generations of thoughtful planning—while ensuring that truly affordable housing is the outcome, not just the promise, of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Association Board and Membership
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

SUBMITTED FOR FAMILY ZONING CUT 11/17/2023



SB 9 does not produce below-market-rate (BMR) units, without a substantial increase in supply, it will not realistically assist moderate, low, or extremely low income households (below 120% AMI) obtain housing.

Many areas of the city with lower land values, high percentages of households of color, and/or with lower outcomes in health, wealth, and life expectancy also have high rates of owner-occupied single family housing, for example, the Bayview (73%), Visitation Valley (70%), and Outer Mission (75%). SB 9 may offer these homeowners the opportunity to add units for extended families or to generate rental income, or gain wealth through lot splits. However, there are significant hurdles to realize these gains. Acquiring financing for project development, navigating a complex permitting process, and having the resiliency to manage the significant disruption and take financial risks of construction are major barriers facing existing homeowners in communities of color and low-income communities. Without City investment in programs that support owner-occupied development, such as construction loans or funding prioritized for owners of color or low-income owners, the more straightforward option would be for existing owners to sell their property, or "cash out," and leave San Francisco for areas with lower home costs. While the bill includes a provision that the applicant of an SB 9 lot split is required to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the lot split approval, it does not apply to SB 9 project without the lot split. And while selling may financially benefit an individual household, this practice has been incrementally devastating to communities of color, Cultural Districts, and areas of the city where residents have a common sense of cultural identity, and a historic and major loss to San Francisco as a whole.

Supervisor Yahmood

## Additional Considerations

THIS IS A PRELUDE TO THE REZONING BEING APPROVED

Beyond the issues addressed above, there are unintended consequences for any legislation and these conditions can be difficult to study and anticipate. Some property owners or developers may use SB 9 to streamline the redevelopment of smaller, existing homes into larger, more expensive single family homes with a small additional unit that may never be rented, undermining the intent of creating more housing stock. Renters are protected by SB 9, but may be vulnerable to unscrupulous landlords due to a variety of circumstances, like being undocumented, in a dire financial state, or otherwise exploited. While the city must implement projects that meet the requirements of SB 9, and other state requirements such as SB 330, the Housing Accountability Act, and others, it may also consider allowable measures to tailor SB 9 through local implementation such as creating owner-occupied development programs that prioritize households of color and low income households, unit parity requirements that balance housing unit size, or others new programs.

NEED MITIGATION. FOR EXAMPLE: WHAT HAPPENED TO SMALL SITES PROGRAM?

## SB 10 Summary

Senate Bill 10 (Wiener)[7] authorizes a local government to adopt an ordinance to zone any parcel for up to 10 units of residential density per parcel, at a height specified in the ordinance if the parcel is located in a transit-rich area or an urban infill site. Specifically, this bill:

TO: LUT FROM: Jorge Schulzish

[7] The legislative history and full text of the bill is available at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB10

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Ryan Patterson |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss; Devon Bolla |
| **Subject:** | RE: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:58:40 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf |

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

Further to the below email, can you please kindly add the attachment to the above-captioned files?

Thank you very much,

Ryan J. Patterson
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Main: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7701
Mobile: (530) 913-7609
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
ryan@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

---

**From:** Devon Bolla <devon@pattersononeill.com>
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:43 PM
**To:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
**Cc:** Ryan Patterson <ryan@pattersononeill.com>; Ephraim Margolin <emargolin@pattersononeill.com>; Sonja Trauss <sonja@yimbylaw.org>
**Subject:** Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
*(she/her)*
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

# PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

***VIA EMAIL***

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

## I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

### A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

### B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

### C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

## II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

## III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

### A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

*for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

### B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

## IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

## V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

## VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

# EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

**Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law**

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

**Summary**

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

**Capacity Projections**

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5.  applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

**Compliance with State Law**

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

**Conclusion**

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

**Jack Farrell, Esq.**
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

# EXHIBIT B

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jane Natoli |
| **To:** | paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf |

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

**Jane Natoli (she/her)**
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

**Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development**
**Mayor Daniel Lurie**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)**
*October 29, 2025*

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

**Salim Damerdji**

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

**Jane Natoli**

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

## Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

**"Soft Sites Method"**

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

**“Citywide Capacity Method”**

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

**"Financial Feasibility Method"**

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

# EXHIBIT C

# Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

# Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

# Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

# Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

# Details of the Rezoning




The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

# The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

# Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

# Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

# Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

# Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

# Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

# Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

# San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

# Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

# High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

# Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios




Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

# Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

| Planning District | Historic, 2000-24 | Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 | High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Buena Vista | 975 | 43 | 90 |
| Central | 72 | 192 | 390 |
| Downtown | 289 | 112 | 230 |
| Ingleside | 0 | 58 | 120 |
| Inner Sunset | 123 | 28 | 59 |
| Marina | 131 | 126 | 263 |
| Mission | 187 | 197 | 406 |
| Northeast | 449 | 136 | 283 |
| Outer Sunset | 15 | 16 | 33 |
| Richmond | 0 | 23 | 47 |
| South Central | 0 | 6 | 11 |
| Western Addition | 997 | 658 | 1,265 |
| Total | 3,238 | 1,594 | 3,199 |

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

# Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

| **Low Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 1,594 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 10,098 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 8,504 |

| **High Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 3,199 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 17,845 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 14,646 |

# Summary by Current Zoning District

| | | Low-Growth | | | High-Growth | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current Zoning[3] | Number of Parcels | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units |
| RH1 | 43,009 | 0.001% | 0.205% | 798 | 0.003% | 0.446% | 1,731 |
| RH2 | 26,486 | 0.002% | 0.259% | 576 | 0.005% | 0.565% | 1,250 |
| RH3_RM1 | 13,741 | 0.009% | 0.347% | 547 | 0.018% | 0.756% | 1,186 |
| Office/Commercial | 114 | 0.570% | 0.780% | 48 | 1.185% | 1.639% | 104 |
| Public | 239 | 0.060% | 1.450% | 3,483 | 0.122% | 2.560% | 4,814 |
| Density-Restricted Multifamily | 7,079 | 0.336% | 0.490% | 3,007 | 0.674% | 1.026% | 5,467 |
| Form-Based Multifamily | 2,053 | 0.725% | 0.725% | 46 | 1.502% | 1.502% | 94 |
| Total | 92,721 | | | 8,504 | | | 14,646 |

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

# Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

# Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

| | **Low Growth Scenario** | **High Growth Scenario** |
|---|---|---|
| Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions) | 8,041 | 13,615 |
| Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5] | 2.0% | 3.4% |
| Price Elasticity of Demand | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| Price Elasticity of Supply | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Percent change in housing prices | -2.5% | -4.2% |
| Corresponding change in condo prices[6] | -$24,500 | -$41,600 |
| Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7] | -$903 | -$1,529 |

# Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

| | Low Growth | High Growth |
|---|---:|---:|
| Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf) | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Disruption-relocation cost/sf | $190 | $190 |
| Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million) | $16 | $28 |

# REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

# Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

# Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

# Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

# Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

| Variable Description | Variable | Data Source |
|---|---|---|
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior | Construc_Cost_Real | a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100 |
| 10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior | Zillow_Price_Real | SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100 |
| Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | Calculated from Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space | zp_Public | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Planning District dummy variables | DIST_<District Name> | Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | Intercept | (1.6226) | 1.2829 | 1.5998 | 0.2059 |
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | 0.0017 | 0.0007 | 4.9693 | 0.0258 |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | 0.0049 | 0.0009 | 30.6563 | 0.0000 |
| Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 5.0369 | 0.0248 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | (0.0023) | 0.0007 | 10.7241 | 0.0011 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | (0.8231) | 0.1222 | 45.3669 | 0.0000 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | (1.0378) | 0.1271 | 66.6847 | 0.0000 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable | Construc_Cost_Real | (0.0992) | 0.0129 | 58.8929 | 0.0000 |
| SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real | Zillow_Price_Real | 0.0143 | 0.0053 | 7.1326 | 0.0076 |
| Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | 0.6303 | 0.1608 | 15.3724 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | 4.2634 | 0.4873 | 76.5337 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | 4.2450 | 0.4523 | 88.0989 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | 5.0508 | 0.4640 | 118.4768 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | 3.4115 | 0.4790 | 50.7257 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Public/Open Space | zp_Public | 1.2491 | 0.8385 | 2.2190 | 0.1363 |
| Zoning = Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | 4.5361 | 0.4999 | 82.3213 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | 0.2674 | 0.6672 | 0.1607 | 0.6885 |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | 1.3187 | 0.6064 | 4.7289 | 0.0297 |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District = South Bayshore | DIST_SBayshore | (1.4824) | 0.3179 | 21.7380 | 0.0000 |
| District = Bernal Heights | DIST_BernalHts | (1.7011) | 0.6087 | 7.8100 | 0.0052 |
| District = South Central | DIST_Scentral | (1.7307) | 0.3867 | 20.0267 | 0.0000 |
| District = Central | DIST_Central | (1.1523) | 0.3353 | 11.8102 | 0.0006 |
| District = Buena Vista | DIST_BuenaVista | (2.5369) | 1.0188 | 6.2010 | 0.0128 |
| District = Northeast | DIST_Northeast | (1.4171) | 0.2539 | 31.1439 | 0.0000 |
| District = Western Addition | DIST_WestAddition | (0.6831) | 0.2362 | 8.3630 | 0.0038 |
| District = South of Market | DIST_SOMA | (0.0756) | 0.1903 | 0.1579 | 0.6911 |
| District = Inner Sunset | DIST_InnerSunset | (1.6187) | 0.4882 | 10.9939 | 0.0009 |
| District = Richmond | DIST_Richmond | (2.8019) | 0.5355 | 27.3716 | 0.0000 |
| District = Ingleside | DIST_Ingleside | (1.8670) | 0.4925 | 14.3711 | 0.0002 |
| District = Outer Sunset | DIST_OuterSunset | (2.6147) | 0.6098 | 18.3867 | 0.0000 |
| District = Marina | DIST_Marina | (1.2492) | 0.3253 | 14.7457 | 0.0001 |
| District = Mission | DIST_Mission | (1.0938) | 0.2380 | 21.1176 | 0.0000 |

*Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:*

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

# Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | St Error | T-Stat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.4252 | 0.0159 | 26.72 |
| State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward) | SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull | 0.4385 | 0.0389 | 11.28 |
| Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted | Zoning_DR_EnvFull | (0.1601) | 0.0174 | (9.22) |

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

# Appendix: Model Performance

| **Logistic Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 3,369,573 |
| Number with Dependent Variable = 1 | 422 |
| Pseudo R-Square | 0.000611 |
| Max Rescaled R-Square | 0.244596 |

| **Units Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 383 |
| R-Sq | 0.867779 |
| Adj R-Sq | 0.866735 |
| Dependent Mean Value | 81.87206 |
| Standard Error of Regression | 48.40184 |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_RH1 | C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1 |
| zp_RH2 | NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2 |
| zp_RH3_RM1 | RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO |
| zp_OfficeComm | C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_DRMulti_RTO | NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_Public | C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public |
| zp_FBDMulti_RTO | DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG |
| zp_PDRInd | DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2 |
| zp_Redev | HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL |

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

# Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

# Staff Contact

**Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist** ted.egan@sfgov.org

**From:** Deldelp Medina
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** Without rent control I would be pushed out of the city
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:49:32 PM

---

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

Mr. Carroll,

I wanted to share with you my experiences and reality. I have been living in San Francisco for the last fifteen years, thanks to rent control. Without being able to live in locally owned apartments, I would not have been able to raise my family here. When new housing is built, it shouldn't be at the expense of units that are keeping folks rooted to their neighborhood. I support incentives to have folks build without displacing those of us who have created homes and communities.

Best,

Deldelp

--
Deldelp Medina
She/Her/Ella
My schedule/Mi Horario: Calendly_Deldelp

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Devon Bolla |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Ryan Patterson; Ephraim Margolin; Sonja Trauss |
| **Subject:** | Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation: File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:44:12 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.11.17 Ltr re SF Family Zoning Plan - RJP.pdf |

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

Good afternoon,

Attached for your review is a memo regarding a proposed family zoning plan and housing element implementation.

Thank you,

Devon J. Bolla
*(she/her)*
Paralegal
Patterson & O'Neill, PC
Office: (415) 907-9110
Direct: (415) 907-7703
Fax: (415) 907-7704
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
devon@pattersononeill.com
www.pattersononeill.com

This email may contain privileged or confidential material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the original sender and delete all copies. Nothing in this email or any attachments should be regarded as tax advice unless expressly stated.

# PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 950
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 907-9110
Facsimile: (415) 907-7704

November 17, 2025

***VIA EMAIL***

Chair Myrna Melgar
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
john.carroll@sfgov.org
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Proposed Family Zoning Plan and Housing Element Implementation
File Nos. 250700, 250701, 251071, 251073, 250985, and 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Supervisors:

Our office represents Yes In My Back Yard ("YIMBY Law"), a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to enforce state housing laws. We write to share our concerns regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("FZP"). Our comments incorporate the comments of YIMBY Action and its members, including the attached letters dated September 11, 2025 and October 29, 2025.

## I. The City Will Violate the Housing Element Law if it Adopts the FZP Knowing that it Will Not Produce the Required Housing Units

The City's 6th cycle housing element noted that the City was unable to identify enough sites to accommodate the number of units for lower- and moderate-income households, including a 15% buffer, that it was assigned to plan for during its 6th cycle ("RHNA Shortfall"). The Department of Housing and Community Development, therefore, directed the City to include a program in its housing element identifying sites for rezoning to accommodate these units as mandated by the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code § 65584.09(a)-(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal. App. 5th 193, 225.) However, the City's proposed rezoning program—Program 7.1.1— and the FZP, which implements Program 7.1.1, are inadequate because (1) the City's own analysis found that the FZP will not create enough units for the City to meet its RHNA Shortfall; (2) the FZP will not create sufficient capacity because it relies on density decontrol in residential neighborhoods without corresponding changes in development standards; and (3) the FZP's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will not increase

density because it is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

### A. The Chief Economist's Report Confirms that the FZP Will Not Create Enough Units for the City to Meet its RHNA Shortfall

On October 29, 2025, the City's Chief Economist published a report, which found that the FZP will produce **less than half** the number of housing units that the City is required to plan for to meet its RHNA Shortfall – in more than double the time allowed. The report concluded that in a best-case scenario, the FZP would only produce around 14,600 additional units over the next 20 years, representing just 40% of the 36,282 units the City is required to plan for over the next eight years. Under a low-growth scenario, the FZP would only produce 8,504 units over 20 years. Either scenario is inadequate and would be a spectacular failure of the City to comply with the Housing Element Law, which requires local governments to plan to meet their RHNA shortfall through rezoning programs. (Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1) and Gov. Code § 65583.2(h).)

### B. The FZP Will Not Create Sufficient Capacity Because it Relies on Density Decontrol in Single-Family Neighborhoods But Does Not Create Room for Additional Density

The FZP uses form-based zoning without corresponding changes in development standards in single-family neighborhoods, which means developers cannot build in these areas. Therefore, the FZP does not actually increase capacity in these neighborhoods.

The FZP uses form-based zoning (also called density decontrol), which regulates the allowed density on a site by setting limits on height, bulk, setbacks, and other features (rather than setting numerical density limits). And while the City claims that the change from the existing numerical density limits to form-based zoning will produce additional units, its refusal to ease the existing limitations on height, bulk, and other standards that limit the buildable envelope for construction in these neighborhoods means there is no actual capacity to build additional units. For example, a lot with an existing single-family home that occupies most or all of the buildable area is unlikely to be redeveloped into multifamily housing because without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and the like, there will be no place to build the additional units.

The FZP promises to increase density, but its use of form-based density without easing height limits, setbacks, parking minimums, and other development standards will prevent building in the City's highest-resourced neighborhoods.

### C. The FZP's Alternative to the State Density Bonus Law Does Not Add Sufficient Density

The City contends that its local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law will create additional capacity for housing production, and it relies on that claim to meet its RHNA shortfall. However, almost all of the capacity that the City is relying on is already available for housing production through the state Density Bonus Law, so the City's local alternative is duplicative of existing capacity under the state Density Bonus Law.

The state Density Bonus Law requires local agencies to grant density bonuses under the state law to qualifying projects. (Gov. Code § 65915(a)(1)-(b).)

The FZP would give applicants a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). Crucially, HCSF does not offer any increase in density beyond what is offered by the state Density Bonus Law in most locations. Moreover, when both the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF are available, applicants can only avail themselves of one.

The state Density Bonus Law is intended as a bonus on *top* of local rules. (Gov. Code § 65915(u)(1).) But the HCSF offers no increase in density beyond what developers are already entitled to under the state Density Bonus Law when a project is eligible for both. Therefore, the HCSF does not create the additional capacity required by the Housing Element Law.

## II. The City Fails to Use the Required "Analytical Model" to Determine the Likelihood of Site Development

The FZP fails to use the "analytical model" required by the City's housing element. When a city includes a program in its housing element, the Housing Element Law makes it mandatory to implement the features of those programs. (Gov. Code § 65581(b); Gov. Code § 65583(c)(1); *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098.)

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." In addition to the Housing Element Law, which makes it mandatory for the City to use an "analytical model," the City's housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. The FZP, however, fails to use an "analytical model," in violation of the housing element. Instead, the FZP uses three alternative methods to estimate how many housing units the FZP will produce, none of which meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1.

First, the City proposes using a "soft sites" method, which assumes that a site that is already developed with a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the FZP's planned residential capacity, and a site that is already developed with a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment with a residential use. This assumption is just that, and not an analytical model. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1.

Second, the City assesses the likelihood of a given site being developed under the rezoning proposal using a model that evaluates whether new housing is financially feasible at a given site. The model assumes that two percent of sites currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites will be redeveloped with economically feasible new housing developments. Again, this is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1 because its assumptions are not grounded in historical development standards in San Francisco, and its focus on financial feasibility is a distinct concept from focusing on "the probability of development." It may be financially feasible for a property to be redeveloped, but that same property can have a low likelihood of being redeveloped for a variety of reasons, especially for single-family homes that play a big role in the FZP, and which already contain high-value structures or the property owner faces financial constraints, lack of development experience, or the need to use the property for their own housing. Moreover, even if this method were accurate, it projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the requirement of 36,282 new units.

The third model that the City relies on involves examining the rate at which units across the City were approved using historical data from 2005-2023 and multiplying that by the theoretical capacity of the sites. This model does not qualify as an "analytical model" because it ignores the fact that much of the development in the City in recent years has taken place on vacant sites or extremely underutilized land. In fact, around 25% of sites that were redeveloped from 2005-2023 had residential uses before redevelopment, while around 84% of sites under the FZP have residential uses. Non-vacant sites already containing residential uses are 70% less likely to be redeveloped according to the City's own analysis, and the FZP errs in assuming that non-vacant and vacant sites will be redeveloped at the same rate. (*See* Housing Element, Appendix B.2, Figure 2.) Since the FZP mostly contains parcels with residential uses, unlike past development, this approach of extrapolating from past development does not correspond to future development predictions.

The areas where housing would be built under the FZP already contain high-value structures, such as single-family homes, where the owners are unlikely or unable to redevelop the site as multi-family housing due to financial constraints, lack of development experience, and the need to use their properties for their own housing.

These areas will have much lower rates of redevelopment, which this model does not take into account. Moreover, this model has unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element. These two reasons disqualify this model from being an "analytical model."

Additionally, the FZP does not create sufficient capacity because it assumes certain large pipeline projects will actually be constructed within the planning period, when in reality such development is exceedingly unlikely – if not impossible. For the Hunters Point/Candlestick project, approximately 3,500 units are located on Navy-owned parcels. The City will not even obtain control of these parcels until the Navy finishes remediation, which is estimated to take at least 11 more years. ("The Navy has recently informed OCII that completion of remediation and conveyance of all portions of the Shipyard Site, excluding Parcel F, to Developer will occur between 2036-2038 . . . ." (Resolution No. 26-2024, available at https://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/2024-08/5.%20RESO%2026-2024_HPS%20Approval%20of%20Amendments%20to%20Redevelopment%20Plan.pdf; *see also* https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/hunters-point-shipyard-radioactive-materials-21129542.php.) Similarly, Treasure Island's phasing includes a maximum of 4,600 units completed before 2031, but the City is counting all 8,000 units toward the pipeline. (*See* https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Ex._JJ_-_SOP.pdf; Treasure Island Sub-Phase Application 3, Schedule of Performance, Exh. JJ, Appendix B, https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/TI_Sub-Phase_Application_3_Book-Revision_1_-_reduced.pdf.)

Since none of the three models that the City considers qualifies as a reasonable "analytical model," the City is violating its legally binding commitment under Program 7.1.1.

## III. The FZP Adds New Constraints On Housing Production and Fails to Analyze the Impact of These Constraints

The FZP adds new constraints on housing development, which were not analyzed in its housing element, in violation of the Housing Element Law and Senate Bill ("SB") 330.

### A. The FZP's New Constraints Violate the Housing Element Law

The FZP adds new constraints on housing production, which it fails to analyze as required by the Housing Element Law. When considering rezoning plans, the Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze new governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5); *see also Californians*

*for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must analyze new constraints].)

The FZP adds new constraints on development that were not analyzed by the City's housing element, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, lower parking maximums, and limits imposed by the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law. As explained above, the FZP imposes new constraints because it deprives applicants of the ability to use the state Density Bonus Law in conjunction with the City's local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. Other constraints reduce physical development capacity, e.g., caps on dwelling unit size that cannot accommodate larger families, and reduce the economic feasibility of developing housing. The FZP does *not* analyze the impact of these policies on housing production. The FZP, therefore, violates the Housing Element Law's requirement that local governments analyze new governmental constraints on housing production if they were not analyzed in a housing element. (Gov. Code § 65583(a)(5).)

### B. The FZP's New Constraints Violate SB 330's Prohibition Against Rezonings Which Decrease Housing Intensity

The FZP's new constraints on housing violate SB 330's prohibition against rezonings which "lessen the intensity of housing." (Gov. Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).)

SB 330—also known as the Housing Crisis Act—prohibits local governments from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would "Chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduc[e] the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018[.]" (*Id.*) SB 330 defines "less intensive use" as including situations where a local government imposes reductions to the height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, maximum lot coverage limitations, or "*any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce [a] site's residential development capacity*." (*Id.*; emph. added.)

As mentioned above, the FZP contains new constraints on housing, including caps on dwelling unit size, limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums, reduces the number of units the FZP will produce. These new constraints run afoul of SB 330 because they reduce the size of units that applicants are able to construct, which physically reduces the intensity of residential use and reduces the financial viability of residential construction. The City has also conducted no analysis to show

that there will be a concurrent increase in intensity of land use to offset the decrease in intensity of land use caused by the FZP. (Gov. Code § 66300(h).)

## IV. The FZP Violates the Housing Element Law By Relying on an Overlay for Nonvacant Sites Where Development of Nonresidential Uses Is Permitted

The FZP violates the recent decision in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach et al.* (2025) 337 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 that overlays cannot be used to meet minimum density requirements required by rezoning programs if they permit developers to redevelop sites for non-residential uses.

As explained above, when a local government cannot accommodate its RHNA Shortfall for lower-income households with a site inventory, it has to include a rezoning program in its housing element. The Housing Element Law also requires jurisdictions that must develop rezoning programs to ensure that at least 50% of the lower income housing the agency must plan for is "accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted." (Gov. Code § 65583.2(h)(2).) As the City acknowledges in Program 7.1.1, it is subject to this statutory minimum density requirement.

In *New Commune*, the court ruled that residential "overlays are unlawful when they allow development below the statutory minimum density [required by Gov. Cod § 65583.2(h)(2)]." (*Id*. at 797.) The court in *New Commune* also noted that residential overlays are unlawful whether they are overlaid over a base zoning that permits residential or industrial and commercial uses. (*Id*.)

The FZP runs afoul of the *New Commune* decision and the Housing Element Law's minimum density requirement because it still permits nonresidential redevelopment of sites. The FZP is an overlay because it does not change the base zoning of properties, but is instead overlaid over existing zones, including non-residential zones. For instance, for properties subject to the FZP developers can still use the underlying C-2 and C-3 zoning to construct commercial structures, which would be below the statutory minimum density because no residential units would be constructed. By permitting developers to build nonresidential projects within the overlay, the FZP violates the Housing Element Law as explained by the court in *New Commune*.

## V. The FZP Violates the Prohibition against Jurisdictions Forcing Applicants to Waive Their Right to Use the State Density Bonus Law

The FZP primarily relies on a local alternative to the state Density Bonus Law, which developers can only use if they waive their right to use the state Density Bonus Law. This is a violation of the state Density Bonus Law.

Local agencies are prohibited from adopting ordinances that conflict with the state Density Bonus Law or using their local alternative to impose development requirements that are more restrictive than the state Density Bonus Law. (*Schreiber v. City of Los Angeles* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 549.) The court in *Schreiber* made it clear that applicants have the right to use the state Density Bonus Law regardless of any local provisions, and that cities cannot deny, limit, or condition the use of the state Density Bonus Law by requiring an applicant to instead use a local alternative.

The FZP creates a local alternative to the state Density Bonus law called Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF"). HCSF—proposed Planning Code Section 206.10(b)(5)—has only one criterion: that applicants agree to "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program[.]" HCSF violates the state Density Bonus Law's prohibition that local agencies cannot bar an applicant from using the state Density Bonus Law, regardless of any local provisions. The FZP illegally forces applicants to choose between the state Density Bonus Law and HCSF, which violates the rule that "an otherwise valid local ordinance that conflicts with the state Density Bonus Law is preempted." (*Latinos Unidos Del Valle De Napa Y Solano v. County of Napa* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1160, 1169.) The City must amend the FZP so that the state Density Bonus Law can be used on *top* of the HCSF, which has the potential to create meaningful housing production.

## VI. Conclusion

We urge the City to comply with the law and remedy the deficiencies in its rezoning plan. If the City fails to significantly increase its proposed residential capacity, there will be no realistic chance of meeting its RHNA obligations. YIMBY Law is prepared to take legal action to hold the City accountable for these clear violations of state housing law.

PATTERSON & O'NEILL, PC

Ryan J. Patterson
General Counsel for Yes In My Back Yard

CC CA Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Encl. September 11, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Letter from Yes In My Back Yard
October 29, 2025 Report from the Chief Economist of San Francisco

# EXHIBIT A

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416
San Francisco, CA 94114
hello@yimbylaw.org

9/11/2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(via email) commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

**Re: San Francisco's Draft Housing Rezoning Program and Compliance with State Law**

Dear Commissioners,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. We write today to express significant concerns regarding the City's proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program and the accompanying "Housing Choice–San Francisco" local bonus ordinance.

**Summary**

While the rezoning plan, including the local program, is a good step forward for housing in San Francisco, we are concerned that the plan does not actually fulfill what it promises to do. The city has produced no publicly available reports that show how the plan will be more capable of delivering the housing San Franciscans desperately need than what state laws already allow. While we support density decontrol, we do not believe the city has shown that the handful of incentives that are coupled with it will be enough to produce any more housing than state laws such as the Density Bonus Law already do.

**Capacity Projections**

San Francisco's Housing Element made a binding commitment to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through a rezoning program rooted in a probabilistic analytical model Program 7.1.1. San Francisco did not base its rezoning on a site's inventory, but on the projected housing based on that model. The targets and assumptions it sets are enforced by Program 8.1.5. If San Francisco does not produce sufficient units, Program 8.1.5.  applies additional upzoning requirements.

Despite the City's commitments to specific unit production, applying the city's own model used to determine the shortfall on the rezone sites, we can determine that the map would produce around 17k homes by 2031, or 47% of the 36k units promised by Program 7.1.1. That regression analysis was built on different logic than the Housing Element's existing capacity analysis. While the proposal does not clearly make up for the RHNA shortfall, its usefulness is difficult to gauge when it functions by different logic than the original rezoning analysis. In order to be comprehensible, realistic, and enforceable, San Francisco must produce a "realistic capacity" table for the rezoned sites that incorporates the Housing Element' regression analysis.

We understand that the City has conducted its own analysis that disputes these figures, but the methodology and details of this analysis have not been made publicly available; therefore we remain concerned and skeptical about the efficacy of the rezoning program in meeting the city's needed housing requirements under housing element law.

**Compliance with State Law**

San Francisco's rezoning program would institute a local density bonus program that, theoretically, according to the city's assertions (which are not supported by any publicly available information), would accommodate the City's RHNA shortfall. The practical and legal realities according to our analysis suggest that it would fail to produce housing at the suggested rates, and fail to meet statutory requirements.

The latest staff report associated with the September 11 Planning Commission hearing notes that 77% of parcels in the rezoning plan fall into the form based zoning code and will not have their heights increased, while for "the vast majority of residential sites, these changes are only available for projects opting into the local program."

Some proposed areas not eligible for the state bonus would benefit from San Francisco's local program. However, this local program would be exclusive to California's state density bonus law in all areas where both options are available. Whether or not the local program is superior to state incentives, the one cannot replace the other. State density bonus law is intended as a bonus on top of local rules, and should not be supplanted when it generally offers superior development potential.

San Francisco's density decontrol is generally less feasible than the state program. While we applaud the city for applying a local density bonus program to projects between 2-4 units, which are not otherwise eligible for the state density bonus, as well as allowing alternatives to providing on-site affordable units, such as off-site developments, for the vast majority of the city's proposed "rezoning" program, state density bonus law offers a superior alternative: unlimited waivers from local zoning and development standards,

providing limited discretion for local review. Comparatively, the local program is far more stringent. It contains strict rules about building size, setbacks, open space, dwelling unit exposure, and parking allowances. It contains only a 15% reduction of other development standards. The proposal would allow for greater than 15% reductions if approved by a discretionary process. Even if that expensive, time consuming process doesn't result in universal denials, it renders the project not code compliant, forcing the developer to lose protections under the Housing Accountability Act.

While we support the majority of the proposed staff changes made to the local program, we believe that they do not go far enough to ensure that the local program is a superior alternative to state density bonus law. For example, the proposal to require projects with 5+ units to reserve a minimum of 25% of the units for 2+BR units is a constraint that is not required under state density bonus law that will negatively impact density potential for the local program. Additionally, the proposed local program not only requires applicants to choose to give up their option to pursue waivers and incentives under state density bonus law, but *any other* state program that provides its own bonuses or waivers from local zoning, such as AB 2011, which offers waivers of local side and rear setback requirements when those requirements limit feasibility, limits front setback requirements, and allows 55 foot heights, which are greater than the 40 foot height limits proposed for the majority of the local program's rezoned sites.

This proposal not only replaces state density bonus allowances with a worse option, it places new constraints on any such developments via inclusionary requirements and requiring new wind studies on construction. These constraints were not reviewed in the Housing Element, meaning that they may not be imposed or that San Francisco must amend its Element to account for those constraints. New constraints must be accounted for in the Element, to demonstrate how San Francisco can realistically meet its RHNA requirements.

San Francisco must also analyze how this program would interact with existing land use regulations. Transfer taxes, inclusionary requirements, and impact fees are key drivers of unit loss, but have not been incorporated into any City analyses yet. We encourage the City Economist to incorporate them into any future analysis of this program.

Even if all of these deficiencies are corrected, they cannot make up for the requirement to change the base zoning of parcels, as required by Housing Element law and HCD interpretation. Under the new scheme, San Francisco would not change its zoned capacity, and therefore would not comply with state law. Density bonuses must add capacity on top of that allowed for in the zoning code.

**Conclusion**

Given the substantial deficiencies in San Francisco's rezoning program and the speculative nature of its local density bonus ordinance, the City's Housing Element certification is at risk. The burden is on San Francisco to demonstrate compliance. The use of analytical models that inflate development probability, the reliance on unproven local bonus mechanisms, and the introduction of new constraints all undermine that burden. In short, the program is not legally defensible as currently drafted, with the limited information supporting the city's conclusions that it exceeds the city's RHNA obligation

YIMBY Law has taken legal action against the City of Los Angeles for a similar failure to deliver a legally compliant rezoning program. We sincerely hope litigation will not be necessary in San Francisco. However, San Francisco will be vulnerable to lawsuits from parties working to ensure that the City complies with state law and delivers a realistic path toward housing affordability and accessibility.

We urge the Board to direct Planning to:

- Re-run the BlueSky regression analysis used for the Housing Element's "existing capacity" estimate on the rezoning proposal to produce a transparent, realistic capacity table that is made publicly available.

- Incorporate the waiver and incentive framework of SDBL into the local bonus program, or ensure that projects can access SDBL concurrently.

- Remove new constraints on development introduced by the ordinance.

- Ensure that the rezoning program meets or exceeds the 36,282-unit requirement via base zoning and that its methodology aligns with Program 7.1.1.

The stakes for San Francisco are high. We urge the City to correct course by allowing the use of density bonus and other state programs in combination with the local program.

Sincerely,

**Jack Farrell, Esq.**
Research Attorney
YIMBY Law

# EXHIBIT B

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jane Natoli |
| **To:** | paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf |

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

**Jane Natoli (she/her)**
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

**Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development**
**Mayor Daniel Lurie**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)**
*October 29, 2025*

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

**Salim Damerdji**

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

**Jane Natoli**

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

## Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

**"Soft Sites Method"**

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

**“Citywide Capacity Method”**

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

**"Financial Feasibility Method"**

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

# EXHIBIT C

# Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

# Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

# Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

# Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

# Details of the Rezoning




The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

# The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

# Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

# Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

# Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

# Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

# Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

# Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

# San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

# Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

# High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

# Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios




Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

# Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

| Planning District | Historic, 2000-24 | Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 | High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Buena Vista | 975 | 43 | 90 |
| Central | 72 | 192 | 390 |
| Downtown | 289 | 112 | 230 |
| Ingleside | 0 | 58 | 120 |
| Inner Sunset | 123 | 28 | 59 |
| Marina | 131 | 126 | 263 |
| Mission | 187 | 197 | 406 |
| Northeast | 449 | 136 | 283 |
| Outer Sunset | 15 | 16 | 33 |
| Richmond | 0 | 23 | 47 |
| South Central | 0 | 6 | 11 |
| Western Addition | 997 | 658 | 1,265 |
| Total | 3,238 | 1,594 | 3,199 |

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

# Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

| **Low Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 1,594 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 10,098 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 8,504 |

| **High Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 3,199 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 17,845 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 14,646 |

# Summary by Current Zoning District

| | | Low-Growth | | | High-Growth | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current Zoning[3] | Number of Parcels | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units |
| RH1 | 43,009 | 0.001% | 0.205% | 798 | 0.003% | 0.446% | 1,731 |
| RH2 | 26,486 | 0.002% | 0.259% | 576 | 0.005% | 0.565% | 1,250 |
| RH3_RM1 | 13,741 | 0.009% | 0.347% | 547 | 0.018% | 0.756% | 1,186 |
| Office/Commercial | 114 | 0.570% | 0.780% | 48 | 1.185% | 1.639% | 104 |
| Public | 239 | 0.060% | 1.450% | 3,483 | 0.122% | 2.560% | 4,814 |
| Density-Restricted Multifamily | 7,079 | 0.336% | 0.490% | 3,007 | 0.674% | 1.026% | 5,467 |
| Form-Based Multifamily | 2,053 | 0.725% | 0.725% | 46 | 1.502% | 1.502% | 94 |
| Total | 92,721 | | | 8,504 | | | 14,646 |

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

# Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

# Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

| | **Low Growth Scenario** | **High Growth Scenario** |
|---|---|---|
| Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions) | 8,041 | 13,615 |
| Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5] | 2.0% | 3.4% |
| Price Elasticity of Demand | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| Price Elasticity of Supply | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Percent change in housing prices | -2.5% | -4.2% |
| Corresponding change in condo prices[6] | -$24,500 | -$41,600 |
| Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7] | -$903 | -$1,529 |

# Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

| | Low Growth | High Growth |
|---|---:|---:|
| Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf) | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Disruption-relocation cost/sf | $190 | $190 |
| Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million) | $16 | $28 |

# REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

# Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

# Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

# Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

# Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

| Variable Description | Variable | Data Source |
|---|---|---|
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior | Construc_Cost_Real | a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100 |
| 10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior | Zillow_Price_Real | SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100 |
| Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | Calculated from Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space | zp_Public | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Planning District dummy variables | DIST_<District Name> | Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | Intercept | (1.6226) | 1.2829 | 1.5998 | 0.2059 |
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | 0.0017 | 0.0007 | 4.9693 | 0.0258 |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | 0.0049 | 0.0009 | 30.6563 | 0.0000 |
| Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 5.0369 | 0.0248 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | (0.0023) | 0.0007 | 10.7241 | 0.0011 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | (0.8231) | 0.1222 | 45.3669 | 0.0000 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | (1.0378) | 0.1271 | 66.6847 | 0.0000 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable | Construc_Cost_Real | (0.0992) | 0.0129 | 58.8929 | 0.0000 |
| SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real | Zillow_Price_Real | 0.0143 | 0.0053 | 7.1326 | 0.0076 |
| Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | 0.6303 | 0.1608 | 15.3724 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | 4.2634 | 0.4873 | 76.5337 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | 4.2450 | 0.4523 | 88.0989 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | 5.0508 | 0.4640 | 118.4768 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | 3.4115 | 0.4790 | 50.7257 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Public/Open Space | zp_Public | 1.2491 | 0.8385 | 2.2190 | 0.1363 |
| Zoning = Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | 4.5361 | 0.4999 | 82.3213 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | 0.2674 | 0.6672 | 0.1607 | 0.6885 |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | 1.3187 | 0.6064 | 4.7289 | 0.0297 |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District = South Bayshore | DIST_SBayshore | (1.4824) | 0.3179 | 21.7380 | 0.0000 |
| District = Bernal Heights | DIST_BernalHts | (1.7011) | 0.6087 | 7.8100 | 0.0052 |
| District = South Central | DIST_Scentral | (1.7307) | 0.3867 | 20.0267 | 0.0000 |
| District = Central | DIST_Central | (1.1523) | 0.3353 | 11.8102 | 0.0006 |
| District = Buena Vista | DIST_BuenaVista | (2.5369) | 1.0188 | 6.2010 | 0.0128 |
| District = Northeast | DIST_Northeast | (1.4171) | 0.2539 | 31.1439 | 0.0000 |
| District = Western Addition | DIST_WestAddition | (0.6831) | 0.2362 | 8.3630 | 0.0038 |
| District = South of Market | DIST_SOMA | (0.0756) | 0.1903 | 0.1579 | 0.6911 |
| District = Inner Sunset | DIST_InnerSunset | (1.6187) | 0.4882 | 10.9939 | 0.0009 |
| District = Richmond | DIST_Richmond | (2.8019) | 0.5355 | 27.3716 | 0.0000 |
| District = Ingleside | DIST_Ingleside | (1.8670) | 0.4925 | 14.3711 | 0.0002 |
| District = Outer Sunset | DIST_OuterSunset | (2.6147) | 0.6098 | 18.3867 | 0.0000 |
| District = Marina | DIST_Marina | (1.2492) | 0.3253 | 14.7457 | 0.0001 |
| District = Mission | DIST_Mission | (1.0938) | 0.2380 | 21.1176 | 0.0000 |

*Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:*

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

# Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | St Error | T-Stat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.4252 | 0.0159 | 26.72 |
| State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward) | SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull | 0.4385 | 0.0389 | 11.28 |
| Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted | Zoning_DR_EnvFull | (0.1601) | 0.0174 | (9.22) |

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

# Appendix: Model Performance

| **Logistic Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 3,369,573 |
| Number with Dependent Variable = 1 | 422 |
| Pseudo R-Square | 0.000611 |
| Max Rescaled R-Square | 0.244596 |

| **Units Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 383 |
| R-Sq | 0.867779 |
| Adj R-Sq | 0.866735 |
| Dependent Mean Value | 81.87206 |
| Standard Error of Regression | 48.40184 |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_RH1 | C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1 |
| zp_RH2 | NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2 |
| zp_RH3_RM1 | RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO |
| zp_OfficeComm | C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_DRMulti_RTO | NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_Public | C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public |
| zp_FBDMulti_RTO | DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG |
| zp_PDRInd | DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2 |
| zp_Redev | HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL |

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

# Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

# Staff Contact

**Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist** ted.egan@sfgov.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | stephenjontorres@gmail.com |
| **Subject:** | FW: Letter for today"s (11/17) agenda |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 2:06:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.11.17 Letter to BoS Land Use and Transpo Committee Re_ TPO and Decontrol Ammendments.pdf |

---

**From:** Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2025 2:05 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Letter for today's (11/17) agenda

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

Hello Clerk Carroll,

Please see the attached letter.

Best,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission District, San Francisco

November 17, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Room 250
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Chairperson Melgar and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I am writing to you to strongly urge that you move forward the amendments submitted by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

There has been a lot of time given to the obligations that our city has to the State and the mandates it has imposed on San Francisco and other municipalities across the state. Mandates that should have been challenged by the Board as other municipalities have. What has not been given appropriate consideration, however, is the obligations that the State has to this City. The obligations to meet the housing affordability crisis that continue to strangle average working class and vulnerable populations out of San Francisco.

Instead we are entertaining conversations about attracting new “vibrant” residents to replace the ones we have. The seniors who have worked their entire lives to age in place in the city they love. The working poor who continue to try and hold on even as hours decrease and jobs dry up. Even those of us that live in subsidized housing face higher rents and less wages with no protections because we have no rent control or tenants protections.

The idea that any San Franciscan is expendable in order to build housing with no guarantees on affordability or sustainability is unconscionable. This body, and by extension, the Board of Supervisors must ensure that all rent-controlled housing is exempt and push back against the State if need be. If we are to be accountable to the State, they and all theiragencies must likwise be accountable to us in full transparency.

You have been elected to represent the interests of your constituents and their future, but not at the expense of their present.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
Resident, District 9
Worker, Districts 8 & 9

**From:** Paul Wermer
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** FILE NO. 250701, Family Zoning Plan (2025-11 -17):
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 12:09:44 PM

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

17 November 2025

To: Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Paul Wermer

Subject: FILE NO. 250701, Family Zoning Plan

I am concerned that the current up zoning plan inadvertently encourages the development of luxury flats in projects for fewer than 9 residential units. If the Residential Nexus study is correct, this will create a demand for 30-40% of the number of BMR Units – with no inclusionary housing provided.

This would aggravate the actual housing shortage and affordability crisis for over 70% of San Franciscan household incomes.

To prevent this, any upzoning must require an inclusionary housing component, and it must be a more meaningful contribution than the current $249.50/sf in-lieu fee. (That covers less than half the cost of a BMR unit)

Background: I have asked Planning staff about this and have received no response so far:

As I read the Family Zoning Plan (version 5 -12, BOS File 25071), my understanding is as follows:

a) Any project complying with the proposed HC-SF (206.10) and Height Limits (sec 263.19 (b)) qualifies for the local program height bonus. It only needs to add one or more units to a building with at least one existing residential unit.

b) By purchasing a 1 or 2 residential unit building (exempt for rent control protections) I could then take a currently zoned RH-2/40 ft height and by adding one additional unit to the project qualify for an 85' structure on a 25x 100 lot, with 18% rear yard, leaving me with at least 1500 sq ft of buildable lot area. At 85 ft height, that would allow 3 luxury units of 3500 - 4000 sq ft. (Condos and TICs, not being rent controlled units, means that multi unit buildings on larger lots are vulnerable as well)

c) There is no inclusionary housing requirement. Given the Residential Nexus report (2016), 3 luxury units would create a demand for somewhere between 0.9 - 1.2 BMR units.

If so, there is a risk of large numbers of projects for fewer than 10 units targeting the top 10% of incomes - which means that this "plan" will actually increase the already unmet demand for units affordable to the wide range of household incomes below $200K, aggravating

availability and affordability.

Has there been any analysis to look at exactly how many lots might be vulnerable to this incentive? This is especially an issue for lots in desirable locations – for example, Lincoln or Fulton with views of Golden Gate Park, and sites with views of the Bay or Ocean.

I should note that I am concerned that 4000 sq ft limit on qualifying residential units is also easily subverted by clever designs.

--
Paul Wermer
San Francisco,CA 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 152 Letters regarding Zoning |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 12:02:13 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 152 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 152 letters regarding zoning.

**File No. 250966, LUT Item No. 4:** General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

**File No. 250700, LUT Item No. 5:** Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

**File No. 251071, LUT Item No. 6:** Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

**File No. 250701, LUT Item No. 7:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

**File No. 251073, LUT Item No. 8:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

**File No. 251072:** Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan (Mayor)

Sincerely,

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Nick Ferris |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 8:24:17 AM |
| **Attachments:** | THD LUC Upzoning Plan 11.17.25.pdf |

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

My apologies. I am adding correct email for President Mandelman.

Nick Ferris
*President,* Telegraph Hill Dwellers

On Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 8:15 AM Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,
>
> The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.
>
> **President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.
>
> In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.
>
> If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:
>
> 1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**
>  - **Exclude all historic resources,** including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>  - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>  - **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
>  - **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).

- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "Use it or Lose It" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within 1⁄2 Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

**2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing**
We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude **all** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

**3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**
THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

**4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**
We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

**5. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**
THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning

District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, President

November 16, 2025
*Via Email*

President Rafael Mandelman and
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rafael Mandelman – *Rafael.Mandleman@sfgov.org*
Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*
Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*

**RE: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan**
**Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025**

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.

**President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.

In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.

If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:

1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

    - **Exclude all historic resources**, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

    - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

- **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
- **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).
- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "*Use it or Lose It*" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within ½ Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. **Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. **Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Neighborhoods United SF |
| **To:** | MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Neighborhoods United - SF |
| **Subject:** | Support for Chan and Chen Amendments; Request for Pause, and HCD Oversight on Family Zoning Plan [Board File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966, "Family Zoning Plan"] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:03:21 AM |
| **Attachments:** | NUSF Letter to LUT_Support for Chan and Chen Amendments and Request for Pause and HCD Oversight on the Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

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

Dear Chairperson and Members of the LUT Committee,

On behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, we respectfully urge the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Committee to take the following actions regarding Mayor Lurie's proposed Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Adopt the amendments** introduced by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.
2. **Place a pause** on the process given the extraordinary and unsettled circumstances in District 4.
3. **Recommend a "Committee of the Whole"** session before forwarding this legislation to the full Board of Supervisors.
4. **Request an extension** from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow for full review, transparency, and participation.
5. **Require HCD leadership to attend** Land Use and Transportation hearings, the Committee of the Whole, and full Board meetings to provide clear, direct answers on state compliance criteria and housing capacity calculations.

Below is further context for each request:

**1. Adopt the Chan and Chen Amendments**
These amendments take essential steps to protect sound housing, historic resources, and

our shoreline, while helping ensure that new development truly serves working families and essential workers.

**2. Pause the Process in Light of District 4 Circumstances**
Given the extraordinary and unsettled conditions in District 4, including the lack of representation and multiple unresolved planning and mapping inconsistencies, it is imperative that the City pause the process. Proceeding without full district representation would be premature and would further erode public confidence in the City's planning process.

**3. Convene a Committee of the Whole Session**
We urge the LUT Committee to recommend a 'Committee of the Whole' session before the legislation advances to the full Board. This will allow all Supervisors to hear public testimony, fully deliberate the proposal, and give time for Mayor Lurie to appoint a new District 4 Supervisor, ensuring every district has representation before a citywide rezoning plan of this scale moves forward.

**4. Request an Extension from HCD**
We further request that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

**5. Require HCD's Direct Participation**
As you deliberate on the City's Family Zoning Plan and its relationship to the certified Housing Element, HCD leadership should be required to attend LUT hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

While we support more housing through thoughtful, responsible planning, Neighborhoods United SF is firmly opposed to the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. The proposal goes far beyond what was envisioned in the certified Housing Element and would irreversibly reshape our city without delivering the affordability or equity it promises.

San Franciscans deserve clarity, accountability, and responsible planning, not conflicting interpretations of state requirements or exaggerated capacity figures that could reshape our city for generations.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to transparent decision-making on behalf of the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lori Brooke
Co-Founder, Neighborhoods United SF
neighborhoodsunitedsf.org

cc:
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
SF Planning Commission
SF Board of Supervisors
Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

**Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:**

Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association
Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village

Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action
Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee
Sunset United Neighbors
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
University Terrace Association
Waterfront Action Committee
Westwood Park Association

**November 15, 2025**

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments and Request for Pause and HCD Oversight on the Family Zoning Plan**

**Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025, Board File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966, "Family Zoning Plan"**

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

On behalf of Neighborhoods United SF, we respectfully urge the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Committee to take the following actions regarding Mayor Lurie's proposed Family Zoning Plan:

1. **Adopt the amendments** introduced by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen.
2. **Place a pause** on the process given the extraordinary and unsettled circumstances in District 4.
3. **Recommend a "Committee of the Whole"** session before forwarding this legislation to the full Board of Supervisors.
4. **Request an extension** from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow for full review, transparency, and participation.
5. **Require HCD leadership to attend** Land Use and Transportation hearings, the Committee of the Whole, and full Board meetings to provide clear, direct answers on state compliance criteria and housing capacity calculations.

Below is further context for each request:

**1. Adopt the Chan and Chen Amendments**
These amendments take essential steps to protect sound housing, historic resources, and our shoreline, while helping ensure that new development truly serves working families and essential workers, not luxury developers.

**2. Pause the Process in Light of District 4 Circumstances**
Given the extraordinary and unsettled conditions in District 4, including the lack of representation and multiple unresolved planning and mapping inconsistencies, it is imperative that the City pause the process. Proceeding without full district representation would be premature and would further erode public confidence in the City's planning process.

**3. Convene a Committee of the Whole Session**
We urge the LUT Committee to recommend a 'Committee of the Whole' session before the legislation advances to the full Board. This will allow all Supervisors to hear public testimony, fully deliberate the proposal, and give time for Mayor Lurie to appoint a new District 4 Supervisor, ensuring every district has representation before a citywide rezoning plan of this scale moves forward.

**4. Request an Extension from HCD**
We further request that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

**5. Require HCD's Direct Participation**
As you deliberate on the City's Family Zoning Plan and its relationship to the certified Housing Element, HCD leadership should be required to attend LUT hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

While we support more housing through thoughtful, responsible planning, Neighborhoods United SF is firmly opposed to the Family Zoning Plan in its current form. The proposal goes far beyond what was envisioned in the certified Housing Element and would irreversibly reshape our city without delivering the affordability or equity it promises.

San Franciscans deserve clarity, accountability, and responsible planning, not conflicting interpretations of state requirements or exaggerated capacity figures that could reshape our city for generations.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to transparent decision-making on behalf of the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lori Brooke
Co-Founder, Neighborhoods United SF
neighborhoodsunitedsf.org

cc:
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
SF Planning Commission
SF Board of Supervisors
Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary, Planning Department

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

**Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:**
Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association
Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village
Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action

Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee
Sunset United Neighbors
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
University Terrace Association
Waterfront Action Committee
Westwood Park Association

**From:** molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 9:58:16 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of Distsrict 1 and support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers. The upzoning of areas like my district would be adversely affected by the proposed upzoning. Building up would ruin the community and unique character of our neighborhoods as well as straining the resources and infrastructure. There are other, more effective ways to provide more housing without destroying our neighborhoods.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** troymcmahan22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Troy McMahan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 8:28:21 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Troy McMahan
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 8:27:19 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I live on Bush Street and I'm not sure why your carved out my block as one of the few to be upsized. That is discrimination and clearly because we are in the poor part of District 2. It's. It fair to target the poor and protect the rich neighborhoods of Pacific Heights.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** Melissa Hernandez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 8:05:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I write this as someone who lives in two-unit rent controlled housing! My neighbors and I don't want to be displaced. We live living in SF and in our neighborhood.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Melissa

Melissa Hernandez
mghernandez117@gmail.com
256 Brighton Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Kristi Dowler
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 7:59:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kristi Dowler
kristdowler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Bunny McFadden
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 7:50:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Bunny McFadden
residue.wooden0h@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** Myra Krieger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** The Up Zoning in Russian Hill Alleys - Pls. Vote NO
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 5:56:06 PM

---

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

Please Retain the 40 Foot

Height Limit on our ALLEYS.

If you allow Six Stories, then Prohibit On Street Parking for new Alley construction .

--
**Myra Krieger**, Staff Reporter
San Francisco Senior Beat
kriegermyra@gmail.com
415-776-7857

**From:** peter.yedidia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Yedidia
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 5:42:49 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm proud to have lived in San Francisco for 50 years, presently in District 3, zip 94133. I dearly love our city and am passionate about the need for more affordable housing. Unfortunately, as written, the Mayor's "Family" upzoning plan will not make housing more affordable and will irreparably harm our name treasured neighborhoods.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Finally, remove North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf from the upzoning map. They were not in the Housing Element and were surprisingly added at the last minute without consultation with neighborhood groups.

Respectfully, San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Peter Yedidia
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** manduin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgan Weiss
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 5:34:49 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

These changes are not yet well vetted, or if they are, then residents don't know enough about it. Understanding that there are some state level requirements, I am sure that with all the bureaucracy in our world there is room for a petition to the governor to limit, or at least delay, requirements until they are fully justified. These expensive projects do not demonstrably close the affordable housing gap. That cost is not just in money, but it is also in irreplaceable space, which, once made available to developers, will be virtually impossible to restore.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morgan Weiss
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** Leah Higgins
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 5:33:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Leah Higgins
leaheloise@yahoo.com
524 Haight Street
San Francisco, 94117

**From:** Sachiel Rosen
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 5:33:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sachiel Rosen
bagghead1@gmail.com
670 34TH AVE
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Samantha Malpiedi
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 5:00:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent in District 8, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero Street
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** kittym@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kitty Margolis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 4:57:01 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a North Beach lifer who has been both a renter and a property owner, I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. We do not deserve to have thoughtless "non-plans" rammed down our throats.

North Beach, a historically important community that was added in at the very last minute, shouldn't even be part of this upzoning conversation. There was no opportunity for community input. Please slow down!

Sincerely,
Kitty Margolis
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Madison Steinke
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 4:55:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am begging you to please support Connie Chan's amendment and protect our beautiful city and its wonderful residents.
The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Madison Steinke
madisteinke@gmail.com
1251 24TH AVE
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Talia Banarie
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 4:10:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Talia Banarie
tbanarie@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** bridget.maley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Maley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 3:46:17 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 3:42:05 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

North Beach and Fisherman's wharf are SF Historical neighborhoods and have had that designation for years, in addition North Beach is the densest neighbor in San Francisco and home to many San Franciscans on rent control. Please support Supervisor Chan's ammendment and insist on HCD participation.

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mark_keleher@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keleher
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 3:32:03 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mark Keleher
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 12:59:02 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

I am a retired teachers living in a rent controlled apartment in the Richmond District. If I lose this apartment, I will not be able to afford another at market rate prices. Please support the Chan and Chen amendments. A plan to create housing should not displace people who have housing. I agree that some form of upzoning needs to happen, but it shouldn't threaten the homes of long term residents.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** editorial@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Harry Pariser
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 12:10:18 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Without an amendment prohibiting demolition of ALL rent controlled housing, many tenants and small businesses will be dislocated, neighborhood character all over SF will decline, but no truly affordable housing will be constructed!

Support the Chan and Chen amendments

Sincerely,
Harry Pariser
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 11:26:59 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Don't let this city be run over by a Weiner who is only trying to  be another useless career politician. We have self governance laws that allow the city to regulate itself and not be bullied by the state or a Weiner.

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 11:26:00 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Lincoln Manor on Clement Street. It is a planned development more than 100 years old. Like several families living here, I have a member of my extended family living with me. I am 92 years old and it makes my living here secure and happy. Otherwise I would have to go into a nursing home. It gives my young family member a place to live while she develops her career.

This neighborhood helped to get the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, a campaign in which I was a leader. It starts a few blocks from here. Neighbors did everything from testifying at hearings to typing the required letters to contributing funds for the campaign.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 10:50:18 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Everyone knows the city needs more housing, but this just gives developers over the top concessions. This can be done in a much more thoughtful manner. I hear calls from lots of people in the city, including the entertainment commission, calling for looser regulations so that San Francisco can be a world-class city, like New York. The thing that makes San Francisco so very special is that it's a livable city. Don't screw it up now

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** jvmahoney67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Mahoney
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 9:05:26 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Harvey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 8:52:15 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I have written before with no changes; East of 15th avenue and Taraval are no buses or streetcars, however, the 65' proposed new height limits include three blocks East to Forest Side avenue.
The block between Funston Avenue and Forest Side Avenue should definitely not be included as it is well over 500' from MUNI.
Please respond.
My other comment is along 15th avenue from Ulloa to Taraval will completely block views for those East of 15th avenue looking West. The beautiful sunsets and seeing the ocean including Fort Funston will be gone.
With no additional infrastructure, all utilities and roads will make this area non-livable and unsafe, not where someone wants to raise a family.

Sincerely,
Thomas Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** cjverb1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Verburg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 8:35:52 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Greetings from a San Francisco resident who first moved here in 1971 and has lived in the Sunset, Pacific Heights, and Russian Hill before settling in North Beach 29 years ago.

I have learned a great deal about the now very-much-outdated State Housing Mandate at neighborhood meetings around the City, and have continued to attend hearings at City Hall despite the conspicuous disappearance of the Land Use & Transportation members during public comment, because the absurd upzoning proposals being rammed down our throats by the Wiener-Lurie-Sauter group and their profiteering backers threaten to destroy the very assets that make SF so popular with the tech-bro crowd seeking new high-end housing, at the expense of the 700,000-plus residents who currently live and work here and love this City as it is.

This is to urge you to:

1. Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

2. Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

3. In making decisions that will change San Francisco forever, base them on what kind of city works best for its residents, not on pandering or potential personal gain.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Carol Verburg
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 7:32:53 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Protect the unique nature of our residential neighborhoods without rushing into changes that will forever alter San Francisco. Listen to what the people want. Let's not destroy historic structures for concrete and glass towers of questionable architectural value. More affordable housing may be needed but let's not throw out the baby with the bath water. In the past, many unfortunate changes were made which could have been avoided with a little more thought. Let's not make affordable housing forever change the character of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** mdarnton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Blodgett
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 2:14:03 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

I live in a in clutch of historic homes called Lincoln Manor spanning a few blocks in the far Outer Richmond between Clement and Geary, 36th-38th Avenues. We host annual block parties and our children zip between the little grid our houses form, sometimes in bare feet, sometimes wobbling on their bikes. It's quiet and clean and safe enough for them to explore their independence as they learn to navigate the city. The stretch of Clement on the north end of our neighborhood is a dedicated bike lane and runs along a green corridor that used to be a Chinese cemetery, now a public golf course that occasionally chucks balls into our back yards. My children collect them and trade the brightly colored ones, which are by far the most coveted. We've set up lemonade stands at the golf course where my son and his best friend, who lives ten houses away within Lincoln Manor, sell used balls for 50 cents and Arnold Palmers - they donate the proceeds to charity and we reward them for their community service with Legos and Rice Crispy treats the size of their fists from Anne at the Garden House Cafe just down the block. We know our neighbors and throw their newspapers a little closer to their front doors, let their dogs out when they're stuck at work, water their plants when they travel... in other words, we've carved out a little slice of sweet, settled, civic life in this bustling, often anonymous and transient city. I cannot imagine how this will change once single family homes are boxed out by multi unit buildings and our little streets are choked with cars. Our backyards won't get sunlight, our children won't know their neighbors, and they won't feel safe practicing biking or dog walking amid the congestion and chaos. This city has many vacant apartments and homes and businesses. There are ample corridors suited for greater development untapped and unrealized - why alter the character and charm of some of San Francisco's little pocket communities just to meet some arbitrary development quota? This is the sort of action that forces young families, especially those that have a tenuous but faithful toehold, out of the city. We are voters and tax payers and community builders. We made the choice to live in this far flung, sleepy corner of the city and we beseech you to respect its integrity and character. Please don't box us out of a life we love.

Sincerely,
Margaret Blodgett
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 1:15:16 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: We are going to look back on this as another era of Urban Renewal. We need to do better.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
Los Angeles, CA 90048

**From:** marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 12:00:19 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

We cannot build our way out of an affordability crisis created by wealth disparity. Those who work for wages, who need mortgages to buy homes, cannot compete with billionaires who view property as houses as investment portfolios. Upzoning does not lower home prices, it raises them because the land value increases proportionately to the investment.

If a home is worth $1m, when that space is rezoned for 8 units (each worth $1m), that land, not eh home, becomes worth more than $8m. The highest bidder gets the land. Those who want homes are thrown out of the equation, thrown out of the city.

We who built this place, who made San Francisco are now being told to get out, to sell to the richest of the rich. As public servants, your job is to serve residents, not cowtow to international investment groups.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:40:33 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of District Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** l_bluestone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Louise Bluestone
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:22:33 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Louise Bluestone
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:21:21 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
L. Diaz
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** dede.estey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Deidre Estey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:00:23 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I live in the Richmond ,near Fulton street alongside the Park.Huge high rises and tower aptments full of small 1 bedrooms will cause the whole area to change with little parking,already full buses during rush hours with a lot of standing already. The problem of destruction to glorious Edwardian homes alongside the park will will horrible! I chose the Richmond for a quiet,residential neighborhood,full of families, and good schools. The beauty of the natural environment will be forever changed and needs,Affordable family accommodations, not million dollar high rises ruining the sun/shade ratio along our streets.

Sincerely,
Deidre Estey
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** tevisajones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tevis Jones
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:33:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

PLEASE support the Chan and Chen amendments to PROTECT existing housing, PRESERVE San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of WORKING FAMILIES, NOT the wealthy citizens who have their hands in the $$pockets of Big Real Estate and always seem to win against the humble residents of San Francisco.

HCD leadership must appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how their housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance and benefit ALL residents of San Francisco, not just the wealthy scions who protect their wealth via real estate. The City of San Francisco (NOW SPONSORED BY PREDATORS) is using inaccurate data to force the working families of San Francisco's Westside to bend the knee to wealthy real estate political actors. HCD must justify their (faulty) numbers or the City will face a middle-class revolt against the wealthy San Francisco political class. (Take note, the hapless NON-Sunset millionaires who squandered big bucks to back Engardio.) This is a struggle for justice between San Francisco's middle class and the ruling oligarchy class of San Francisco for the true spirit of our city, and we're focused on activating justice for EVERYONE in this city, something that has been missing from San Francisco for a long time as it's sunk into cronyism and oligarchy.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. DO NOT DESTROY THE REMAINING MIDDLE-CLASS OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE WESTERN NEIGHBORHOODS!

Additional comments: I've lived in the Sunset for 30 years, and we've already been subjected to outsize housing with no onsite parking on a toxic site that San Francisco refused to deal with properly, plus City government threats of more community destruction. I do not trust San Francisco city government - it has become a creature of the bicycle coalition and the wealthy residents who are as undemocratic as the BOS in their attempts to manipulate middle class neighborhoods. San Francisco is completely disrespectful of the Sunset & the Richmond (is it due to our lack of wealth and/or your racism??)
**Thank you so much to Supervisors Connie Chan & Chyanne Chen, who respect & value San Francisco's diverse middle class and who refuse to bend the knee to the wealth-powered citizens of San Francisco & beyond (including the bicycle coalition & almost all elements of city government including sfrecpark) that are corruptly partnering with real estate magnates & wealthy parties to destroy the Western Neighborhoods where the remaining SF middle class resides. THIS is what the proliferation of aggressive coercive forcible housing actions (using maga tactics to bludgeon the middle class on the Westside) will create: the destruction of the middle class in San Francisco's Western Neighborhoods, and then the city that once stood on an alabaster hilll will lose sadly but justly its heart.

Sincerely,
Tevis Jones
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** r9dennis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Shiraki
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:50:25 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Dennis Shiraki
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:34:05 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** em-s@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:32:10 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** jmmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Matthew Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:09:59 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

For decades San Francisco has withstood attempts by developers to ruin the character of its neighborhoods in the pursuit of profit. Why now are you sacrificing the essence of what makes San Francisco unique? You can achieve more functional housing by working within existing zoning but removing regulation and delay that makes construction unnecessarily expensive.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Matthew Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** homeagain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Mazgai
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:09:24 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Mazgai
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** jmmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Matthew Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:52:34 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

The upzoning plan as presented will destroy the character of San Francisco's north waterfront surrounding Telegraph Hill, North Beach and Russian Hill. It is a giveaway to developers at the expense of residents who pay the taxes that support city government.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
John Matthew Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:44:13 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I am strongly opposed to making the Van Ness corridor into a Miami like setting with huge high rises. . This zoning is way too high and will ruin neighborhoods adjacent. Spread out in other areas instead of putting the majority of the burden on Van ness please.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:39:11 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** bdethiers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Dethiers
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:30:54 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long term North Beach resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bernard Dethiers
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:11:39 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in the Inner Sunset for 45 years, and in San Francisco for 54 years. I think this is a very wrong headed plan. Why not start with building by retrofitting the empty buildings downtown first? And start with empty spaces first?? I am really afraid I won't recognize not just my neighborhood, but my City!!

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: Please rethink this. We need to prioritize rent controlled buildings and long term tenants!

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Mikalis.Faklys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Faklis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:59:58 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Faklis
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** lehr.david@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dave Lehr
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:40:31 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Dave Lehr
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:39:03 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:29:49 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors & the Planning Comission:

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This plan doesn't seem to have any basis in the needs of the whole population of San Francisco. Once we have common sense planned buildings completed to meet the current needs of San Francisco then, we as a city, can look toward other building that might look toward the future and what the population might look like. We don't want to end up as a city like those around Lake Tahoe or others in Silicon Valley that don't have the housing to support all of the different "classes" of people needed to keep the city alive and thriving.

Thank you for reading my thoughts.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:28:22 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps.
- Reconsider the proposed height of buildings along Van Ness. I am especially concerned that this plan will result in YEARS of destruction and construction in the Van Ness corridor already having had construction destroy businesses for the new bus lane. There are neighborhoods adjacent to the Van Ness corridor that will be destroyed by the excessive height of the buildings along Van Ness and stretching up the adjacent streets
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:16:57 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:15:15 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

I am concerned in general that upzoning is inequitable. The western Russian Hill Neighbors, will be drastically impacted  and were never informed by planningn and still are unaware. it is no surprise that this occurred as this may be related to the fact that the extreme zoning has been dumped on our area. On 11/3  I  submitted some of the names, addresses, phone numbers or emails to no avail.

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** ThomasWeed@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Weed
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:03:17 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Weed

**From:** sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:59:14 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

How would you feel if an eight story apartment building became your next door neighbor?

Protect existing San Francisco housing.

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn

**From:** pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:56:57 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Bringing more housing into the downtown San Francisco area is more realistic. High rise buildings
Are here and people living in the area are needed to make it more like New York City .

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** tessa_oleary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of tessa oleary
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:56:29 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
tessa oleary
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** audreycrls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Carlson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:54:51 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance. I am extremely concerned that our State Senator Scott Weiner will continue to layer additional bonus floors to what SF Planning says will be the highest building heights.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Audrey Carlson
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** ratt57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug McKirahan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:54:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Doug McKirahan
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:52:05 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:50:29 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:48:14 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

**From:** don.ayers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Ayers
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 3:47:12 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Don Ayers

**From:** kcdegnan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of KC Degnan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 9:47:35 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie and San Francisco Supervisors:

There is a heart-breaking exhibit at the Museum of San Francisco (Commercial Street) about the "urban renewal" project that destroyed the Western Addition and Japantown in the 1960s in the name of "progress." Please, please do not make the same irreparable mistake again with a misguided (however well intentioned) "up zoning" plan that is not transparent or well thought-through. What has been proposed will not address the housing issue allegedly at stake. Listen to your constituents who will be impacted by this ill-conceived plan.

I urge you to support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

There are real and serious questions about this process. For this to be truly transparent, HCD leadership must appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance. It would be very helpful to explain other options that were considered and why they were rejected so citizens can better understand the proposed "strategy."

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions. Visit the exhibit at the Museum of San Francisco before you go down in history as making the same devastating mistake.

Sincerely,
KC Degnan
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 8:26:08 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** connie.rubiano@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Constance Rubiano
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 7:18:28 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in SF for 47 years. Please amend this proposal to include affordable housing for people who are not in the 1%.

We do need MORE HOUSING IN SF. BUT for whom? This upzoning SHOULD NOT INCLUDE DEMOLISHING EXISTING HOUSING, ESPECIALLY THAT WHICH IS NOW RENT-CONTROLLED.

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Constance Rubiano
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** norkydeg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norman Degelman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 4:49:04 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The private sector will not solve the housing problem. They are more concerned with making a profit. They are not concerned with providing affordable housing for people.

Sincerely,
Norman Degelman
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:46:42 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: I was born  and have lived in San Francisco for over 70 years, the majority in the Richmond district. I understand the desire for growth. The current proposal greatly increases height limits on every other block in the Richmond - Supposedly where the muni lines are. However, the 31 Balboa was eliminated for several years and the 2 Clement still has not returned. Will all bus lines be guaranteed ?
We do not need to give carte blanc to luxury developers, to build mostly tiny studios & one br apts while building heights that greatly impact the sunshine/light  and create wind tunnels in the neighborhood. We should ensure our wondrous and unique vistas and neighborhoods. We should not be eliminating parking requirements to simply create more units for the developers. Elderly and citizens with disabilities need to be able to drive and park. Three blocks to a muni stop is too much of a barrier for many to maintain their independence for shopping and other ADL.
Any legislation needs to ensure that San Francisco retains its personality and is actually livable and not just a labyrinth of tiny overcrowded rabbit hutches

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** epaulshi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Yang Deng
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:08:50 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you in support of the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Yang Deng
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** leishi92@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lei Shi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:07:48 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

I demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Lei Shi
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Cici Lee |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; commission.secretary@sfgov.org |
| **Subject:** | Heigh Limit |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:26:21 PM |

---

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

Dear City Leaders;

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn our little alley into a dark and slot canyons that not one wants to live in.

Thanks,
Cici Lee
1332 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** Cici Lee
**To:** commission.secretary@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
**Subject:** height Limit
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:17:40 PM

---

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

Dear City Leaders;

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn our little alley into a dark and slot canyons that not one wants to live in.

Thanks,
Cici Lee
1332 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathy Howard |
| **To:** | ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrilStaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); So, Lydia (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | BOS LUTC Family Zoning Plan items - Nov. 17, 2025 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 16, 2025 7:11:06 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The entire City voted on District 4's Great Highway, but once again **District 4**, through no fault of our own, **has NO voice in the upzoning legislation**. This is despite the fact that the upzoning legislation could result in bulldozing our entire neighborhood.

This is **upzoning without representation.** You should postpone this vote until the mayor acts on appointing a replacement. *We are tired of being ignored*.

I urge you to form a Committee of the Whole, including our new Supervisor, to allow all of the Supervisors to hear public testimony and fully deliberate the upzoning proposal. Our new Supervisor should also first spend time in our neighborhood, learning what our residents want to have happen to their home. Whether or not this person is a rubber-stamp for the zoning plan and ignores residents' concerns will determine their ability to be elected in June.

I also ask that the City seek an extension from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow adequate time for proper environmental review, public engagement, and a full evaluation of the proposed amendments' impacts on existing neighborhoods and housing capacity calculations. Transparency and thorough review should take precedence over arbitrary timelines.

HCD leadership should be required to attend BOS LUTC hearings, Committee of the Whole, and the full Board meeting. Their participation is critical so that ***all 11*** Supervisors and the public can receive direct, transparent answers on how housing capacity is being calculated, how compliance with state mandates is determined, and how proposed amendments will affect San Francisco's standing with the State.

As to the legislation, many changes must be made:

- **Eliminate in-lieu fees**. In-lieu fees delay affordable housing and create exclusive enclaves of luxury housing.

- **Dedicate all suitable public land – excluding parks and public open space - to 100%**

**affordable housing.**

- **Preserve the Coastal Zone as it is today.**
- **Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.** It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation.
- **Repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system**.
- **Protect historic and culturally significant buildings, districts and open space.** All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings, districts, and open space** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.
- **Prevent height increases near parks and schools.** Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character of our district that the City claims to value.
- **Install the emergency firefighting system before more density is built, or a major quake and the ocean winds could result in an unstoppable fire that will run from west to east over all of San Francisco.**

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

District 4

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Rick Bond |
| **To:** | Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission.secretary@sfgov.org |
| **Subject:** | No slot canyons! |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 16, 2025 7:05:56 PM |

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

City leaders,

Please retain the 40 foot height limit on our little streets. Raising the limit will turn them into dark, forbidding slot canyons.

Thanks,
Rick Bond
21 Russell St, San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** desireemiles@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Desiree Maggiora Miles
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 5:31:26 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
To Mayor Lurie & Honorable SF Officials,
I take great pride in being a second generation San Franciscan, my parents being first born children of wonderful Italian Immigrants, our grandparents. On my son's paternal side, he is a Fifth Generation San Franciscan, also taking great pride in the fact that his great-grandfather and great uncles, The Miles Brothers , were well-known local photographers in San Francisco at the time of the Great Earthquake of 1906 and took humbling photos of our beloved City in ruins during the days following that historic event. The Miles Brothers sadly lost their studios as a result of the devastating quake but their photos of City Hall after the quake and Market Street a day before are indelible in archives of San Francisco history! I very much appreciate your kind review of my comments and background. The rich history that our families share and the amazing bond that we have with San Francisco is immeasurable. I urgently implore you, Mayor Lurie , and SF Supervisors ,Officials and Planners to RETHINK the plan for up zoning our great City neighborhoods. I vehemently reject the current planning proposals. They will decimate our neighborhood businesses, drive up affordability and not mitigate the issues that they claim to address. The flavor of our neighborhoods will be lost , as well as practical issues like parking spaces - destructive ideas like meters in residential neighborhoods - would wreak havoc on current residents as well as potential, future residents have already been proposed . Our beloved SF is a unique landscape and thus requires careful attention to details of locations, views, services needed to accommodate additional numbers of residents and many other factors that would impact affordability for anyone attempting to enter the rental or home ownership market in our varied neighborhoods. PLEASE fight back against Senator Scott Wiener's dictatorship of required housing in the State of CA and TAMP DOWN these unreasonable mandates to make our City more affordable to live in for some more residents and NOT UNAFFORDABLE FOR MANY!!!!! We have limited space which will impact affordability so a reasonable compromise will help additional residents-although mot many more- to be able to have an OPPORTUNITY to live in our amazing neighborhoods and thrive. Thank you again for your kind and prompts attention to this matter

Sincerely,
Desiree Maggiora Miles

San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** PhilD01210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Dillard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 4:56:07 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:
Monday's pending Planning Commission hearing on District 3 is, frankly, an abomination of process and a serious failure of representation. I say that as a proud American, a Navy veteran, a capitalist and entrepreneur, and a 17 year San Francisco resident who has lived more than 10 of those years on Green Street in North Beach.
I have already attended multiple hearings on this upzoning and related changes. At the last one, this item was pushed so far back on the agenda that, like many working residents, I had to leave for client meetings before public comment was called. The people who can stay all day tend to be retirees, union contingents, and insiders. Working age residents who are building businesses, paying high rents or mortgages, and raising families are effectively excluded.
And even when we do speak, it does not feel like public comment is taken seriously. Residents from across the neighborhood spoke clearly and in good faith. Commissioners and staff listened, then went right back to minutiae and a predetermined agenda. That is not genuine engagement. It is a box checked.
I am very active in my community. I attend Telegraph Hill Dwellers, Russian Hill and North Beach neighbors meetings. I volunteer with North Beach Citizens and talk with residents, seniors, families, workers and small business owners every week. I walk this city day and night and there is nothing like North Beach anywhere else in San Francisco.
Almost no one I know of working age is aware of the true scope of BOS File 250682 and the related upzoning proposals. When they do learn what is being proposed, they are unanimously opposed. They do not want the elimination of the North Beach Special Use District. They do not want larger commercial footprints that invite chains. They do not want the erosion of conditional use review that silences neighbors. They do not want priority processing that strips away notice and hearings.
They definitely do not want more speculative high rise development that produces empty "safe deposit boxes in the sky" for absentee investors. I live across from one of those towers. It is mostly dark. It does nothing for our housing crisis and nothing for our community.
I have seen this pattern before. I watched it in Chicago and Philadelphia. We have all heard the stories of Seattle and Vancouver, where once distinctive neighborhoods were hollowed out by high rise luxury development, chain retail, and absentee ownership. Within a decade, the culture and small business ecosystem that drew people there in the first place was pushed out.
North Beach is the opposite of that. It is one of the few truly thriving, mixed use, mixed income, small business driven neighborhoods left in this city. People come from all over San Francisco and all over the world to experience something authentic here. The legislation in BOS 250682 and the Upzoning Plan attack the very tools that protected this place for decades.
There is a deep hypocrisy in preaching local democracy, community voice, and equity while pushing top down state and mayoral mandates on the most densely populated district in the city, over the clear objections of the people who actually live and work here. North Beach is already dense. District 3 is already dense. We have existing underused

buildings and existing permits that could be activated without destroying the fabric of the neighborhood.
We are not anti housing. We are not anti development. We are against bad planning and lazy, one size fits all policy th

Sincerely,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Bridget Dyer
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 4:36:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,
Bridget Dyer
Hans Hony
Renters

Bridget Dyer
bridgetdyer@gmail.com
14 Prospect Ave,
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Dean Brown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 12:25:24 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

I live on Carl street and my wife and I often walk down Irving street and there's just tons of 1 story buildings where we could have 3 stories of housing on top and a commercial floor on the bottom. I have kids and grandkids and want them to have a chance to live here. One bedroom apartments rent for more than $2,000 per month and we need all types of housing.

This housing problem did not happen overnight and it won't be solve quickly. However, the Family Zoning Plan is an important step in the right direction and should be approved.

I support Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance, and the Mayor has signaled support.
And I oppose Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state approval.

We need to get moving on this housing issue and I am tired of how long it takes to get things done in San Francisco. Please pass this plan so we can move on to building more housing.

Thanks,

Dean

Dean Brown
mondean@gmail.com
458 Carl street
SAN FRANCISCO , California 94117

**From:** Simone Alberti
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 9:56:56 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Simone Alberti
simo.alb88@gmail.com
131 Noe St.
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 8:04:06 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

**From:** dolbay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liam Hennessy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 6:29:07 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Liam Hennessy
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lgpetty |
| **To:** | MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; mahmoudstaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | All Tenant Protection Ordinance Amendments Require Due Deliberation |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 15, 2025 5:33:17 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write in support of Supervisor Cheyanne Chen's Tenant Protection Ordinance and to urge you not to "disappear" all the other amendments to it that have been proposed by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

In our democracy (yes we still have one) every serious proposal deserves serious consideration in a fair hearing and open decision process.

The public are entitled to know about all of the TPO amendment proposals -- in clear words, and in full. They are entitled to time and opportunity to examine them freely. People are entitled to express their opinions on them -- softly in writing; loudly in public. And, not least of all, the public are entitled to know the position of each of their representatives on each of the proposals.

Or has San Francisco fallen into an elitist shadow world where electeds get to ignore proposed legislation that might help the people, and hide the proposals so deeply that the people are forever denied them?

San Francisco government must not operate in secret.

Would any Supervisor take away the People's basic rights? For what reason? For "efficiency"? For political advantage? For monetary gain? For misguided fear of higher government reprisal? Or just because some can't stand the "noise" in a noisy, messy democracy?

I'll be delighted if you prove San Francisco is indeed still a democracy by giving all the Chan and Chen TPO amendments a full airing.

Lorraine Petty

-For Affordable Housing.
-Against Demolition of Sound Residential Housing.
-D2/5 Voter.

**From:** nora.chin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nora Chin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 4:29:50 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nora Chin
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** brideynewman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Newman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 3:25:38 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a District 1 resident; my family has lived in the Richmond District for 45 years. I support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers. I ask that you do the same. Beyond the fact that we lack fire-fighting infrastructure from 12th Avenue to the sea in the Richmond and 19th Avenue to the sea in the Sunset, building towers on sand is sheer folly.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

Ted Egan, San Francisco's Chief Economist, pointed out in his recent report that a high growth scenario under the Upzoning Plan that would include eliminating over 6,000 current rent-controlled housing units and demolishing the sites of hundreds of small businesses would decrease rent on the average apartment by $125/month. However, he also states that "Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars." Density does not equal affordability.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Bridget Newman
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Xoe Watchman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 2:20:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Xoe Watchman
xoewatchman@gmail.com
2008 BALBOA ST
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Andrew Nelson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 2:10:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

On a personal note, as residents of North Beach for almost two decades and recent small business owners in the neighborhood, the lack of protections for rent controlled units and small businesses in the mayor's big beautiful family zoning plan keeps my wife and I awake at night. As poets in one of the most important neighborhoods for art and poetry in the world, we will not accept any vision of our neighborhood that prioritizes the financial gain of a few real estate developers over the centuries of culture created by the artists & poets who have made our neighborhood so desirable to developers in the first place.

Sincerely,

Andrew Paul Nelson & Caitlyn Sky Wild
Owner/operators of Golden Sardine
362 Columbus Ave.

Andrew Nelson
afishwithfrogseyes@gmail.com
362 Columbus Ave
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** joanneshanahan135@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of joanne shanahan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 1:38:54 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 4th generation San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and will permanently change the whole feel out our neighborhoods. The one thing k I e always loved about SF is all the totally different neighborhoods we have. You can choose single family houses or downtown vibes.

We ask on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I realize the need for more housing but is building high rises in neighborhoods where there isnt any the right thing to do? I think a scaled back version would better suit the city I live.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
joanne shanahan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Madhuri Mudaliar
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 1:18:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Madhuri Mudaliar
mmmudaliar1998@gmail.com
2951 Bush Street
San Francisco , California 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Sultan Mirza |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Please Retain the 40 Foot Height Limit on our ALLEYS - Russian Hill |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 15, 2025 11:34:48 AM |

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

Good morning,

Please Retain the 40 Foot Height Limit on our ALLEYS in historic Russian Hill.

If you allow Six Stories, then Prohibit On Street Parking for new Alley construction.

Thank you,

Sultan Mirza
1218 Green St, San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** Ciara Keegan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:32:11 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge your support of the combined amendments of Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan, specifically:

Don't Demolish Tenant Homes – Over 45,000 renters are at increased risk of displacement as a result of the Plan's increased incentives to demolish tenant-occupied flats in North Beach, Upper Chinatown, Noe Valley, Buena Vista, the Castro, the Sunset, the Marina and the Richmond. SF Planning confirmed in its original plan analysis that we did not need to redevelop rent-controlled homes to meet our unit count goal. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's common-sense amendment to remove all residential flats from the local plan, knowing we don't need to displace hard-working San Franciscans to build the housing we need.

Protect the Public Waterfront – San Francisco once led the nation with thoughtful and sustainable planning that kept our public coast and bay waterfronts safe from overdevelopment. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to remove the coastal and waterfront parcels that would be exposed to Trumpian privatization and luxury development. We are not Mar-a-Lago!

Build Real Family-Sized Housing – The mayor's Plan currently has no mandatory unit requirements, but rather offers 2-bedroom units as an "option" for developers. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposed amendment to the new density decontrol provisions the mayor put into the plan this year, which incentivize more $4000/month "microunits" – instead of the 2- and 3-bedroom homes families need.

Comply With Housing Element, Preserve PEGs – The unanimously adopted Housing Element was clear: Priority Equity Geographies have already born the brunt of development displacement, and yet the mayor included PEG neighborhoods into his new map. This is not what the Board adopted and approved, with support from community. I support Supervisor Chyanne Chen's proposed amendment to protect the PEGs as previously adopted.

Preserve Our Cultural & Historic Assets – We can build the housing we need without destroying San Francisco's cultural and historic assets. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment to protect historic resources in this plan.

Build the Affordable Housing We Need – The mayor has proposed selling off 27+ public sites, which are critical to the construction of the 46,000 units of affordable housing SF is required to build by 2031. I support Supervisor Connie Chan's proposal to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District to maximize our public land for affordable housing.

While we did not elect the anonymous Sacramento bureaucrats at the HCD, we elected you all to be legislators and policy-makers who will advocate for us to the State and do what's best for SF. The mayor claims our hands are tied and we have to let HCD write our laws or we will lose "local control" – if you have to run your emails by HCD officials for approval, it would appear we already have.

Politicians were given a clear mandate from voters this past Election Day – we will support you, when you stand up for us. Don't be the Democrats that bungle another opportunity to fight for real affordable housing for us all – please show some political willpower, moral courage and leadership. Don't let your legacy be making San Francisco a city only for millionaires.

Sincerely,

Ciara Keegan
ciaraksf@gmail.com
4225 23rd Street
San Francisco, California 94114

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | terrencemchugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terry McHugh |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:30:58 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:  With all the building that has already been approved and in the system, why are we in such a hurry to completely change Dist 4 and parts of Dist 7. People out here paid and are paying to be similar to what it is now. No one wants towers ( remember The Pink Palace and Geneva Towers), views blocked, shadows in backyards and all new buildings with no parking.

Sincerely,
Terry McHugh
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bettymillermd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betty miller Kolotkin |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:28:41 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Betty miller Kolotkin

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:25:22 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No one who lives in this city wants to spend the next decade or more living in a construction zone with constant noise, pollution, and disruption. All to benefit a few already obscenely wealthy developers, who have proven time and again that they have no interest in affordable housing or the history of this great city. As a 33 year resident of San Francisco, I feel that San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | nayrbgo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bryan Sanders |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:23:05 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Bryan Sanders

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:21:59 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | DMacDonald@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald MacDonald |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:20:43 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
I live in Pacific Heights and am very concerned about the current blanket approach to upzoning across the city. Specifically the provisions in the current plan to make every corner buildable to 65 feet. I foresee this provision having severely negative, unintended speculative consequences that not only destroy neighborhood character but also adjacent property values. This provision is going to upset everyone!! Another provision which will precipitate highly negative, unintended speculative consequences is increasing the buildable height to 65 feet for the Marina Safeway lot. The Marina Safeway is the only major grocery store with parking for the neighborhood. If this store were to close for redevelopment due to the increased allowable buildable height, the neighborhood would suffer a major amenity loss for which the neighborhood would bear a high, long-term cost and loss of value. Thank you for your consideration of these points of major concern.

Sincerely,
Donald MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:18:05 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Please let the unlicensed understand where and why each supervisor stands on this critical issue

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sflronline@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Herbert F Mintz II |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:17:07 AM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly. This is not right!

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands. Don't let those critical amendments die in committee!

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance. Don't let the HCD hide in the shadows!

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I have spoken before this BOS committee about the fact that the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System infrastructure does not extend much into its western and southern neighborhoods. That is definitely a public safety issue that needs to be addressed. I still think this issue deserves a hearing before the full BOS.

However, right now give the Chan and Chen amendments the public debate they deserve!

Sincerely,
Herbert F Mintz II
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** llakkis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Lakkis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:10:45 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Blanket up-zoning has never been shown to be an effective means to solve housing shortages. San Francisco is a very beautiful, special city that should be protected and our supervisors and city officials should be fighting to protect it, not signing legislation to destroy it. 14 story buildings have no place being built on streets like Jackson, Broadway, and Pacific. My husband and I have recently relocated from Pittsburgh, PA and are living in a 7 story building on Jackson between Franklin and Gough. A 14 story building would be completely out of place in this neighborhood and would increase traffic, which is already too much and too fast in our residential neighborhood. There are no guarantees in your plan that would even require developers to build so-called "family housing" Random upzoning in inappropriate areas will not help. And to call this a transit corridor is ridiculous. It takes my husband 40 minutes to get to the Caltrain from here every morning. Anyone who thinks we should have 14 story buildings in our neighborhood or that is a transit corridor is not familiar enough with this neighborhood to make these momentous descisions.

Sincerely,
Lisa Lakkis
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** cyssf2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Shih
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:09:40 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My addition to this email: I was active in the Engardio recall because his actions severely damaged the quality of life for the western side of SF by the closure of the Great Highway and his obvious allegiance to the anti-car activitists/tech money instead of his constituents. The so called Family Zoning plan is anything BUT a "family" plan with the upzoning that allows the demolition of single family homes, rent controlled units, and small business units. The amendments to limit the PERMANENT potential damage upzoning the "Family" zoning will allow must be included and even more amendments to protect historic buildings, green spaces, views.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Christina Shih
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | katmacdphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn MacDonald |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:08:40 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kathryn MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:08:35 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:06:39 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** breall@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sophie Breall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:04:59 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

I'm a long time home owner in Balboa Terrace. While I appreciate the need for more housing, I want height limitations and input into design. Don't make this into Richmond Specials that are hideous and falling apart.

Sincerely,
Sophie Breall
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:04:41 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 11:00:49 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Please don't block the amendments. This is a public issue. We want and need HCD to attend these upzoning meetings. Many seniors like myself are struggling just to survive in our current housing. If we were to lose it to upzoning we would become homeless and die. Please have mercy. Thank you.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | aebrooke98@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Brooke |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:59:36 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

I am a lifelong resident of san francisco and I hold dear the communities in our city. I do not want to see the zoning laws changed in the city as it will obviously result in demolishing of buildings, displacing residents and business and raising housing prices. Please consider these common sense amendments to protect the city we love.

Sincerely,
Audrey Brooke
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** uluusurf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of BRETT GOBAR
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:59:26 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
BRETT GOBAR
Encinitas, CA 92024

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:44:26 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | larry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Habegger |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:40:28 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I cannot make it to the hearing today, but I strongly support the amendments put forward by these two supervisors. Please add them to the resolution to create a more fair housing plan.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Larry Habegger
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | acxavier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Xavier |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:40:04 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | antenored@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis antenore |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:39:26 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Dennis antenore
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** tesw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tes Welborn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:36:44 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I have heard for years that HCD/ABAG/etc. require San Francisco approve some 80,000 new housing units. Yet the state refuses to fund this mandate. And San Francisco has had a declining population for years. So, where is the pressure coming from?? I suspect the real estate industry. San Francisco's Planning Committee should hold a public meeting with HCD to explain their demands and who benefits.

Certainly the small businesses do not - and they are the job creators in San Francisco, not big corporations.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have heard for years that HCD/ABAG/etc. require San Francisco approve some 80,000 new housing units. Yet the state refuses to fund this mandate. And San Francisco has had a declining population for years. So, where is the pressure coming from?? I suspect the real estate industry. San Francisco's Planning Committee should hold a public meeting with HCD to explain their demands.

Sincerely,
Tes Welborn
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Altobelli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:34:10 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
Housing that is affordable, below market rate is what is needed,not housing for the rich . We need to maintain residential & commercial property which is already housing & serving the San Francisco residents that currently live & work here. The people of San Francisco absolutely need to have a voice in this what appears to be a land grab which will forever change the city we care for. This has been my neighborhood for over 30 years. Housing & improving the City is wonderful but the ideas that we've been able to see & perhaps will not continue to see seem hasty & Ill conceived. Go back to the drawing board , listen & implement the amendments Supervisor Chan & Chen have proposed & keep meetings with HCD Public . Common sense & careful planning is what we need . This is a city for people if all economic levels, don't shut out the average folks . We live in a city that celebrates diversity, let's maintain that in housing & businesses.. San Francisco is not a playground for the rich.Its for all of us.

Sincerely,
Janice Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:33:53 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
George Sery

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | rogerh104@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Hansen |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:33:22 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Roger Hansen
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** molliespack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:31:36 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a born and raised San Franciscan, living in District 1 for 60 years. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): our city is unique and the current upzonIng plan paved a way to destroying the history, charm and character of our smaller neighborhoods. There are other ways to provide more affordable housing; this will not provide for such. It may increase inventory of new, shiny residences that are not affordable to the working class, eliminate mom and pop businesses, eliminate affordable rentals, and destroy the community and character of our beloved city.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Judi Gorski |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:30:48 AM |

---

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

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Chenstaff@sfgov.org
Mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Cc: Board of Supervisors
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

From: Judi Gorski, D4 Resident
judigorski@gmail.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Re: Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mandelman:

This is a request that you please postpone discussing and amending the Family Housing Plan and reschedule it to after the Mayor has appointed a Supervisor for District 4 and after District 4 constituents have had time to meet with their new Supervisor. District 4 wants to be a part of discussions concerning the Housing Plan and suggest amendments to it, but we do not have a representative to speak for us in City Hall yet. Please seriously consider postponing this to a later date. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
District 4 Resident

**From:** victoria.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Victoria Giampaoli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:27:18 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Please stop this upzoning it's a horrible idea and ruins the charm of this city. Do not go over 3- 4 stories—- we don't want this place to look like NY. There are tons of vacant buildings and many other areas of the city that this would not affect. Thank for your time.

Sincerely,
Victoria Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | merlegoldstone2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Merle Goldstone |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:26:36 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Merle Goldstone
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** nhf009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Fee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:24:31 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. Let's protect and preserve what we all love about San Francisco and work together openly and with common sense to meet our actual and projected needs for affordable housing,

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nancy Fee

**From:** scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:45 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:30 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** dmscott01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Scott
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:23:13 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. STOP DESTROYING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD! There are already sufficient units in the pipeline to satisfy state requirements, it's been shown - so move what's been approved, don't destroy and displace to satisfy greed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Scott
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:22:22 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountability.

Sup. Melgar, do not block these amendments, please. This is the moment for you to prove you are as you declare, for the middle class and small businesses. Do not give in to the greed of developers and realtors.

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Bradley-Foley |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:39 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Margaret Bradley-Foley
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** janrobbins7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jan Robbins
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:28 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jan Robbins

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | erikafrick111@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Frick |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:21:23 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a Nob Hill resident of over 25 years, I am extremely concerned about supervisors going along with upzoning that ruins the beauty of our City, creates condos very few people will ever be able to afford, and ignores common sense approaches like converting vacant office spaces. As well, all rent controlled housing should be preserved.

We’re hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Erika Frick
San Francisco, CA 94108

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | janrobbins7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jan Robbins |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:49 AM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Jan Robbins

**From:** diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of diana giampaoli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:43 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS please take into consideration all the empty buildings that could be retrofitted for housing. If you need to build only 4 stories. We are not NY. Quit making these developers your friends richer. This won't house the homeless or low income.

Sincerely,
diana giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** acxavier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Xavier
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:38 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie,

As a San Franciscan in D7,  I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Your  upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement !

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | erin.dress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Dress |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:20:34 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won’t invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Please bring greater transparency to this process so people know what is happening with these changes.

Sincerely,
Erin Dress
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:19:29 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bette_stockton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bette Stockton |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:19:24 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

My husband and I have been residents of North Beach since 1970 and homeowners on Chestnut St. since 1991. These drastic changes to our neighborhood and other areas of San Francisco will not accomplish the most pressing needs - affordable housing and protection for long term residents under rent control. We are not against building but what is proposed so far is not in the City's best interests. We need accountable planning that is transparent.

Sincerely,
Bette Stockton
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** dmscott01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Scott
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:18:21 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments: The West Side has become a political target for political ambitions - and blocking sensible amendments further insults West Side residents (who have recalled one supervisor for disregarding their input). It's time for the BOS and Supervisor Melgar to respect those residents, and stop caving to wealthy corporate interests, aided by those seeking higher political office.

Sincerely,
Diana Scott
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:39 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a tenant in District 3 - North Beach I am appalled at this threat to myself and other tenants for continuing to live our apartments. This leaves tenants no recourse to remain in their rent controlled apartments, pushes to demolish buildings and replace them with buildings that only upper income residents can afford and the destruction of small businesses that are the life of our community. This is a move to force middle and lower income residents out of San Francisco!

You must vote against amendments that won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** hedarobi5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Davies
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:29 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress

Thank you for hearing me. Thank you for your work. Please fight for low-income people. Please retain the diversity of San Francisco and keep the integrity of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
David Davies
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | cdamkroger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Courtney Damkroger |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:17:29 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. Support a democratic process!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Courtney Damkroger
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:58 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | jennkroot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Kroot |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:34 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:
PLEASE DON'T DEMOLISH SF, PRETENDING THAT IT WILL HELP ANYONE BUT DEVELOPERS AND POLITICIANS BACKED BY THEM.
I'm so angry about the power of the developers and real estate interests backing neo lib politicians and creating the mythology that building taller and denser will help unhoused folks and working class people. I know that you are aware that there are over 10k empty units right now and that Airbnb has taken thousands of units as well as the fact that there are tons of empty buildings throughout downtown that could be turned into housing.
Without the Chan/Chen amendments, your plan will displace more low income people. You are only helping developers and people who have the money to get 2nd homes (many of these new units end up being investment property and second homes and so many of them remain empty!!!!!). I'm sure you know this already.
I have a lot more that I'd like to say, but I doubt that you've even read what I've written here.
By the way, I'm a bay area native.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kroot
San Francisco, CA 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | liberthson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dan Liberthson |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:16:23 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Apparently, Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

It is important that the Land Use Committee advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

It is vitally important for the livability of our city that tenants and sound structures be protected. SF should be SF, not Manhattan, which it could become in part if the State's housing mandates are allowed to go forward without reasonable assessment and restraints. San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Sincerely,
Dan Liberthson
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | hedarobi5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Davies |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:15:22 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

If my choice is between the State of California taking over our planning, the builder's remedy, and the Lurie plan, I'll take choose the State.

The Lurie plan might be called the Blackstone Plan as initially it just sets up speculators buy now and get richer when new zoning makes properties more valuable.

Sincerely,
David Davies
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:15:22 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:13:30 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:12:30 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | films@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Irving |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 9:55:31 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I can't attend in person because I work. PLEASE advance the proposed Chan and Chen amendments to the full Board. The public needs to see where every Supervisor stands.

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block these amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly. HCD leadership needs to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning. You might think you're doing the right thing by refusing to listen to your constituents, but don't be surprised if lawsuits challenge your decisions.

Sincerely,
Judy Irving
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** EmanuelaEstera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emanuela Neagu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 9:50:01 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emanuela Neagu
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | EmanuelaEstera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emanuela Neagu |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 9:49:06 AM |

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We're hearing that Supervisor Melgar plans to block the Chan and Chen amendments and won't invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Land Use Committee must advance Chan and Chen's compliant amendments to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and accountable planning.

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Emanuela Neagu
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** erinaulairedonnelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Donnelly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 9:23:32 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Additional comments: City planning's stated intention and goal to protect rent controlled housing needs to be backed up with legislation.
Pass laws that protect all renters in our homes.
Renters are the majority in SF and we will vote only for those who support our rights.
Legislate protections for our vibrant small businesses and our precious coastline.
Support and protect your citizens and our beautiful city and coast from being sold off to the highest bidder and demolished.

Sincerely,
Erin Donnelly
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** marilee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marilee Gaffney
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 9:05:33 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families, not luxury developers.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Sincerely,
Marilee Gaffney
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Approve Chan"s Amendments & Insist on HCD Participation [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 8:54:33 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Support the Chan and Chen amendments to protect existing housing, preserve San Francisco's historic and coastal resources, and make sure future growth meets the needs of working families who work in the city but cannot live here due to the high rents. Some of these workers make $70-75 annually. The city does not need more luxury apartments.

Also demand that HCD leadership appear before the Board of Supervisors to explain how housing numbers are determined and how the proposed upzoning will affect compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparency and fair, fact-based planning decisions.

Let's keep San Francisco affordable and beautiful.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | tia.lombardi@gmail.com |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | San Francisco Heritage Letter of Support |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 11:46:54 AM |
| **Attachments:** | SFHeritage-SUPPORT-Chan-Amendments.pdf |

---

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

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, Mahmood, and Chan:

Please accept San Francisco's letter of support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments to the Family Zoning Plan.

Thank you!

Tia Lombardi
San Francisco Heritage, Board Member

Sent from my iPhone

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

November 12, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar, Supervisors Chyanne Chen and Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by and our conversations with Mayor Lurie and President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,



Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Judi Gorski |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 10:30:58 AM |

---

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

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
Chenstaff@sfgov.org
Mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Cc: Board of Supervisors
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

From: Judi Gorski, D4 Resident
judigorski@gmail.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Re: Land Use and Transportation Meeting, 11/17/25, 1:30 pm - Take No Action on Upzoning Until D4 Has Representation

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mandelman:

This is a request that you please postpone discussing and amending the Family Housing Plan and reschedule it to after the Mayor has appointed a Supervisor for District 4 and after District 4 constituents have had time to meet with their new Supervisor. District 4 wants to be a part of discussions concerning the Housing Plan and suggest amendments to it, but we do not have a representative to speak for us in City Hall yet. Please seriously consider postponing this to a later date. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
District 4 Resident

**From:** Sam Woodworth
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** One Last Chance to Stop the Destruction of San Francisco
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 10:27:25 AM

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

Supervisors,

Today is your chance to stop the destruction of San Francisco and avoid a legacy of infamy and ignominy that will endure for many decades to come. Over and over you've heard overwhelmingly from residents and business associations that neither the people of San Francisco nor the millions of tourists who undergird the city's economy are interested in walls of monolithic condo towers obliterating treasured public vistas, blocking out the sun, generating wind tunnels, displacing tenants and small businesses, and irreparably destroying the unique and world-class beauty of San Francisco -- all so that luxury developers and wealthy landowners can line their pockets.

The developer lobby wants you to believe that upzoning will promote affordability, but that argument has been thoroughly debunked, including by the Federal Reserve Bank-SF. https://www.frbsf.org/research-and-insights/publications/working-papers/2025/03/supply-constraints-do-not-explain-house-price-and-quantity-growth-across-u-s-cities/. Even the city's *own analysis* shows that this argument is a steaming pile of manure. https://newspack-missionlocal.s3.amazonaws.com/mission/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/250700_economic_impact_final.pdf

Will you stand with the people of San Francisco, or with developers, speculators, and the future buyers of luxury condos? Find the backbone to say "no" to this generationally short-sighted and catastrophic mistake. You are not powerless. The current plan drastically over-zones relative to State mandates and fails to count huge recent increases in zoned capacity. The City is not required to capitulate and should take the State to court if necessary.

At a bare minimum, support the Chan and Chen amendments, and require HCD to be present as you debate whether to drive a stake through the heart of San Francisco.

Thank you,
Sam Woodworth
Homeowner, Russian Hill

**From:** George Wooding
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); George Wooding
**Subject:** 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 17, 2025 Land Use and Transportation
**Date:** Monday, November 17, 2025 8:51:15 AM

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

Hi John, Please consider this my written testimony. I hope that all is well with you. Please consider me a disabled person and place me in front of the line

November 16, 2025

Dear Land Use and Transportation committee members.
Melgar, Chen and Mahmood,

Supervisor Connie Chan's amendments are vital for the mayor's family plan to succeed.

**Vote No on the Mayor's failed Family Housing plan.**

What happened to the "affordable housing" mandates? They have disappeared.

Here is what the Planning Department's new report, "Rezoning Capacity Calculations," doesn't say: under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, **57% of those new homes—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable** to low- and very-low-income households. That's not a suggestion; it's part of the state mandate.

The Family Zoning Plan has no funding strategy, no framework for public land, and no realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most. The city is relying completely on developers, grants, GOBs and subsidized funding from the MOHCD.

## WHY WASN'T SAN FRANCISCO' CHIEF ECONOMIST CONSULTED ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

### The balance between supply and demand

San Francisco Politicians and planners don't understand economics. They believe that if they build more units, the price of housing will decrease. This is not true in San Francisco due to market conditions.

Building more houses may not lower prices if there is a simultaneous increase in demand, or if sellers are unwilling to sell for less, a phenomenon known as "
downside stickiness". Other factors like high mortgage rates, rising construction costs, and localized market dynamics can also offset the downward pressure on prices that new supply would typically create.

In a basic economic model, increased supply would lead to lower prices if demand remains constant. However, a parallel increase in demand can keep prices stable or even cause them to rise, despite the new houses.

**Rising demand**: Population growth, wage increases, favorable

demographic trends, or an influx of institutional investors can drive up demand, absorbing new inventory as it enters the market.

**Pent-up demand**: In areas that have historically restricted development, a sudden increase in construction can be absorbed by years of pent-up demand, causing prices to plateau rather than fall.

The main cause of higher house prices in SF is the cost of land. Buildable Land is becoming so scarce that only Subsidized affordable housing will be built. The cost of affordable housing will continue to rise

Substitutions and proposed amendments On September 30, a new version of number 250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. The report analysis reflects those changes

On October 21, supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the local program on any parcel containing more than two existing housing units which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control

Also, on October 21, supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space As the language of these two amendments were made public last week this report does not attempt to model there economic impact.

-developers are not building due to high land costs and the scarcity of buildable land, high interest rates and high construction costs

-There are almost no grants. Despite best efforts, The Mayors Office Of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is currently underfunded and has little ability to subsidize low-income housing in San Francisco.

The dearth of affordable housing was predictable.

-The CPC is currently not trying to attain more housing funding:

**Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond (Prop A)**:
**Approval:** On March 5, 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a $300 million bond to finance the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing. The funding is on its first tranche--$147.2M

**2019 Affordable Housing GOB ($600 million).** Approximately $175.9 million remains outstanding, with a final issuance under consideration for late 2025. $55M is being held for the Mercy Housing build beside Laguna Honda Hospital for a senior center.

**Voter approval is required**: Parcel taxes are special taxes that require voter approval to be enacted. They are not tied to the value of your property.

Mayor Lurie and the MTC are also working on a Parcel tax that will generate $85M - $250M annually for eleven to 14 years. The parcel tax will be almost exclusively on property owners with little passthrough to renters, 2/3rds of SF residents are renters. This parcel tax needs a (50% + 1) citizens vote to pass on November, 2026. This tax is certain to pass.

## AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

-Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants. Absolutely. Please don't forget to protect the landlords.

-Implementing Nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the city is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well -resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, an increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;

The West side EWSS project is already corrupted. The City no

longer wants to build Kaboda piping for high water pressure. Cisterns allow 100 to 250 psi.  Kaboda piping remains constant at 300 psi.The fire department is now building large cisterns filled with water and they are also purchasing pump trucks that will connect to other pump tracks. This will allow the fire department to purchase more fire trucks. The cisterns will be attached to the pump trucks which have a limited range. The Kubota piping would have been a much better delivery system but the fire department wanted the trucks. The West side of San Francisco is more in danger of burning than ever before.

The requested reports would be a great idea

-The Mayor's Family Plan does not require developers to build or fix infrastructure.  The City will  bear the full cost of repairs.  This is wrong.  The developer should bare the costs of their own project.

-Placing a shot clock to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031;  The Planning Department already has 70,000 stored at planning

**Factors that influence review time**

- **Project complexity:** The scope and size of a project are major factors in the review timeline. Simple projects may be approved more quickly "over the counter," while complex projects may involve multiple reviews and public hearings.
- **Other reviewing agencies:** Building permits must be reviewed by multiple city departments for safety and code compliance. A permit can be sent back to Planning for another review if changes are made to the plans.
- **Permit type:** The type of permit being applied for, such as a building permit, coastal zone permit, or variance, all have

different review processes and timeframes.

- **Application completeness:** Incomplete applications can significantly delay the review process. An application can go through multiple rounds of resubmissions before being accepted for review

LIMITING FORM BASED DENSITY:

Density decontrol is central to the Mayors' family zoning plan. This is the worst type of density planning. A developer can now add as many residential units as they want too. An eight story building can Have thirty units or only one unit. Density decontrol was added to the Mayor's family zoning plan so that San Francisco would have more units then SB 79. This will be uncontrolled density. The city will not stop this program as San Francisco planning is desperate not to be controlled by the state of California

"Density decontrol" was a core component of the initial "**Family "Zoning Plan** legislation introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie at the Board of Supervisors on **June 24, 2025**.
The concept of density decontrol, which removes unit limits while maintaining existing height and form restrictions, was part of the plan from its formal introduction as legislation, and was also included in earlier draft proposals developed by the Planning Department under former Mayor London Breed. The legislation is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

"Form-based density" is not an inherently negative planning concept; rather, **specific implementations of form-based codes (FBCs) may face criticisms related to how density is managed, or some residents may object to the very idea of increased density** which FBCs often facilitate.
Common criticisms or perceived negative aspects related to form-based

codes and density include:

- **Community Opposition to Increased Density:** A primary objection from some local residents is that FBCs "promote density and population increases to the detriment of locals" or conflict with an existing "small-town feel". The perception of form-based codes mandating high density can lead to community pushback during the adoption process.
- **Potential for Gentrification:** By creating highly desirable, walkable communities, FBCs can inadvertently result in new developments that sell or rent at a premium, potentially pricing out lower-income residents if affordable housing provisions are not included in the code.
- **Complexity and Administration Challenges:** Form-based codes can be more complex to write and administer than conventional Euclidean zoning, requiring specialized training for planners and staff to interpret design standards objectively. This complexity can lead to confusion, increased review times, or a greater need for variances if the code is not carefully written.
- **"Locking in" Undesirable Existing Forms:** If a form-based code is based strictly on the current urban fabric of an area, it might inadvertently "lock in" low-density, car-dependent patterns, making it harder to densify those areas later if needed to address housing shortages or promote sustainability.
- **Ignoring Market Realities:** Critics sometimes argue that FBCs are overly prescriptive or ignore market demands, although proponents argue that market studies are often a key component of a well-crafted FBC. In some cases, a local market may not be able to support the specific mixed-use or retail components called for in the code.
- **Loss of Perceived "Local Control":** FBCs often streamline the approval process by making projects that meet the code "by-right" (administrative review without public hearings), which some residents or community groups may see as a reduction in public

participation and control over individual projects

There should be an amendment for form based density, but San Francisco well never pass this amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | D M LaPointe |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Wtpcc Delegates; Wtpcc Officers; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Farrah, Michael (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning - continue item |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 8:33:06 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 11-17 LU Hearing - WTPCC.docx |

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

Please find attached a letter of concern from WTPCC on the Family Zoning Plan.

--
Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

**West of Twin Peaks Central Council**
*A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936*

WTPCC

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127
http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

November 17, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council represents some of San Francisco's most longstanding and community-driven neighborhoods - places shaped over generations by residents who invested time, resources, and civic energy into making them safe, livable, and environmentally functioning. These neighborhoods work because they reflect thoughtful neighborhood stewardship, stable planning patterns, and infrastructure-supported growth.

The proposed Family Zoning Plan disregards that history. It subjects these neighborhoods to an extreme, ideology-driven experiment that ignores infrastructure limits, discards long-established planning principles, and threatens to permanently destabilize the Westside - all without delivering real affordability or meeting any demonstrated planning need.

At the same time, District 4 - ground zero for many of these proposed changes - currently lacks stable representation. Advancing a sweeping rezoning that disproportionately targets District 4 without its elected voice at the table is not only unjust; it violates the basic expectations of fairness and transparency that residents deserve from their government.

WTPCC has been firm and consistent: density decontrol does not belong in San Francisco's interior neighborhoods. It is unnecessary, it is harmful, and it is being directed intentionally at stable homeowner areas precisely because they have been successful.

SB 79 already imposes the largest mandatory rezoning the Westside has ever faced. This new state law forces dramatic, by-right density increases along major corridor - including Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue, and Sloat Boulevard - regardless of local concerns, transit capacity, or neighborhood conditions. These state mandates alone will accelerate teardown pressure, intensify construction, strain emergency response and school capacity, and overwhelm transit and utility systems that are already stretched thin.

The severity of SB 79 is not theoretical. Its impacts are imminent and unavoidable.

Recent representations from City Hall suggesting that the Family Zoning Plan is "better than SB 79," or that it must be passed for San Francisco to be exempt from SB 79's requirements, are simply not accurate. The exemption window created by SB 79 is temporary and expires in 2032 regardless of whether the Family Zoning Plan passes. In other words, the City will not avoid SB 79 by adopting an aggressive, citywide rezoning - state law

will still apply. What the Family Zoning Plan does is impose an additional, discretionary upzoning *on top of* SB 79, not in place of it.

Given the scale of these mandatory state changes, the City's choice to add an additional, discretionary layer of density decontrol in stable residential neighborhoods that SB 79 *does not* touch is unreasonable and heavy-handed. No planning rationale - not housing production, not compliance, not affordability - justifies piling a second wave of deregulation on top of a state mandate that is already transformative.

This is not responsible planning. It is punitive policymaking directed at long-established homeowner neighborhoods for ideological reasons, not practical ones.

Additional density decontrol would:

- Invite speculative teardowns and irreversible conversions
- Displace long-time families and erode community stability
- Reduce predictability for homeowners and property owners
- Undermine a century of intentional neighborhood planning
- Deliver no meaningful affordability or equity outcomes

Protecting historic resources and the architectural fabric of the Westside is essential to maintaining San Francisco's identity and livability. WTPCC neighborhoods include coherent planning patterns and intact early- and mid-century homes that embody the architectural fabric of the western neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan provides no meaningful safeguards against the permanent loss of these irreplaceable assets.

Infrastructure realities cannot be dismissed. The Westside already faces:

- Overloaded and unreliable transit
- Congested streets and inadequate traffic management
- Aging water and sewer systems never designed for unlimited growth
- Emergency response stretched thin across large geographic areas
- Schools operating at or beyond capacity

To assume that infrastructure will "catch up later" is not planning - it is negligence. Growth must follow infrastructure, not race ahead of it.

The City must also demand transparency from HCD. Conflicting and inflated capacity assumptions cannot be used to justify unnecessary upzoning. The City should:

- Seek an extension from HCD
- Require all compliance guidance to be made public
- Ensure the City is not pressured into upzoning beyond what state law actually requires

San Franciscans deserve honest planning - not shifting numbers used to justify a predetermined outcome.

For generations, WTPCC neighborhoods have served as anchors for San Francisco's middle-class and homeowner stability. They are not barriers to progress. They are the communities that make San Francisco livable, attractive, and sustainable.

We urge the Committee to take corrective action:

- Remove density decontrol from the Family Zoning Plan
- Restore meaningful protections for historic and architectural resources
- Address infrastructure deficits *before* approving any significant rezoning
- Seek an HCD extension and demand transparent guidance
- Guarantee full District 4 representation before advancing any westside upzoning

San Francisco can meet its housing goals without sacrificing the livability, architectural fabric, and stability of the West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods. We ask you to protect these neighborhoods and the families-homeowners and tenants alike-who have sustained them for generations.

Sincerely,
Denise LaPointe
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Board of Supervisors

Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development, City and County of San Francisco

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Planning Director

WTPCC Delegates

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Nick Ferris |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Re: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 17, 2025 8:24:16 AM |
| **Attachments:** | THD LUC Upzoning Plan 11.17.25.pdf |

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

My apologies. I am adding correct email for President Mandelman.

Nick Ferris
*President,* Telegraph Hill Dwellers

On Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 8:15 AM Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,
>
> The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.
>
> **President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.
>
> In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.
>
> If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:
>
> 1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**
>  - **Exclude all historic resources,** including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>  - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).
>  - **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
>  - **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).

- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "Use it or Lose It" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within 1⁄2 Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

**2. Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing**
We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude **all** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

**3. Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**
THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

**4. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**
We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

**5. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**
THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning

District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, President

November 16, 2025
*Via Email*

President Rafael Mandelman and
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rafael Mandelman – *Rafael.Mandleman@sfgov.org*
Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*
Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*

**RE: Support for Chan and Chen Amendments to the Family Zoning Plan**
**Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Items 4-7, November 17, 2025**

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"), but we implore you to adopt the amendments offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen that will help to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses and provide a plan for development of the 100% affordable housing we so desperately need. We also continue to urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan, which was not contemplated in the 2022 Housing Element or Mayor Breed's zoning proposal.

**President Mandelman, we urge you to please schedule a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all of the proposed amendments.** We are concerned that the Land Use and Transportation Committee may consider tabling and killing the Chan and Chen amendments in committee. We hope not. But, if so, you will have abdicated your responsibility to the democratic process. The full Board of Supervisors deserves a chance to consider these amendments. And, the public deserves to know where each supervisor stands.

In any event, a vote to approve the Upzoning Plan is premature until you have full analysis and clarity on the implications of SB 79 for the Upzoning Plan, not just the 5-page fact-sheet summary prepared by the Planning Department.

If you move forward with this Upzoning Plan, please adopt the following amendments:

1. **Approve Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

    - **Exclude all historic resources**, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers, from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

    - **Exclude All Existing Residential Units, including all rent-controlled units** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251073).

- **Remove the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District** ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan (Chen File No. 251071).
- **Remove the Coastal Zone** from the Upzoning Plan (Chan File No. 251071).
- **Remove Form-Based Density in the Base Zoning in All Districts** (Chan File No. 251073).
- **Adopt a Progress Requirement** for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval – "*Use it or Lose It*" (Chan File No. 251073)
- **Require Inclusionary Affordable Housing Within ½ Mile** of the development (Chan File No. 251073).

2. **Amend Supervisor Melgar's Legislation to Remove All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent-controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

3. **Approve Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

4. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

5. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") or considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These areas represent one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

And, although the 2022 Housing Element and EIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. This is a far greater percentage increase than any other area in the City. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lgpetty |
| **To:** | MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; mahmoudstaff@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | All Tenant Protection Ordinance Amendments Require Due Deliberation |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 15, 2025 5:33:13 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write in support of Supervisor Cheyanne Chen's Tenant Protection Ordinance and to urge you not to "disappear" all the other amendments to it that have been proposed by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

In our democracy (yes we still have one) every serious proposal deserves serious consideration in a fair hearing and open decision process.

The public are entitled to know about all of the TPO amendment proposals -- in clear words, and in full. They are entitled to time and opportunity to examine them freely. People are entitled to express their opinions on them -- softly in writing; loudly in public. And, not least of all, the public are entitled to know the position of each of their representatives on each of the proposals.

Or has San Francisco fallen into an elitist shadow world where electeds get to ignore proposed legislation that might help the people, and hide the proposals so deeply that the people are forever denied them?

San Francisco government must not operate in secret.

Would any Supervisor take away the People's basic rights? For what reason? For "efficiency"? For political advantage? For monetary gain? For misguided fear of higher government reprisal? Or just because some can't stand the "noise" in a noisy, messy democracy?

I'll be delighted if you prove San Francisco is indeed still a democracy by giving all the Chan and Chen TPO amendments a full airing.

Lorraine Petty

-For Affordable Housing.
-Against Demolition of Sound Residential Housing.
-D2/5 Voter.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Sharon Ng |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Rosa Chen |
| **Subject:** | Re: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073) |
| **Date:** | Friday, November 14, 2025 1:54:45 PM |
| **Attachments:** | CCDC Land Use & Transportation Committee FZP Letter 11.17.2025.pdf |

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

(Including the attachment here)

**Sharon Ng**
Community Planner | Planning and Policy Team
Pronouns: *she/her/hers*
**Chinatown Community Development Center**
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

---

**From:** Sharon Ng
**Sent:** Friday, November 14, 2025 1:51 PM
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; chyanne.chen@sfgov.org <chyanne.chen@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** john.carroll@sfgov.org <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Rosa Chen <rosa.chen@chinatowncdc.org>
**Subject:** Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)

Dear Supervisors and Clerk Carroll,

Please see CCDC's letter attached on the Family Zoning Plan scheduled for the November 17th Land Use and Transportation hearing, and please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you!
Sharon

**Sharon Ng**
Community Planner | Planning and Policy Team
Pronouns: *she/her/hers*
**Chinatown Community Development Center**
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

Chinatown Community Development Center
華協中心
615 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94108
TEL 415.984.1450
FAX 415.362.7992
TTY 415.984.9910
www.chinatowncdc.org

November 14, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**Re: Family Zoning Plan (Board File #250966, 250700, 251071, 250701, 251073)**

Dear Supervisors,

Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) writes to express our concerns with the Family Zoning Plan. While we recognize the need for more housing, this plan as written does not center the needs of the city's working class and low-income residents.

We support the amendments for:

- Prohibiting the demolition of rent-controlled housing in the local program
- Removing form-based density in the base zoning
- Removing all Priority Equity Geographies from the rezoning

Through years of tenant counseling and community organizing, we've seen how sweeping zoning changes—without adequate tenant protections or affordable housing strategies—lead to demolitions, evictions, and displacement. This plan risks fueling speculation by giving developers new incentives to rebuild properties for profit through greater height and density, encouraging the removal of long-term renters—often low-income seniors and families—without providing full tenant protections.

Mrs. Lee's story is a notorious case that comes to mind. In 2013, CCDC supported Mr. and Mrs. Lee and their adult daughter with a disability when they were evicted from their home of over 30 years, where the developer planned to convert all rental units into high-end TICs. In the 10 years following the eviction, the family could not get into affordable housing. This particular case highlights the consequences of when displacement is coupled with the insufficient number of affordable units accessible to extremely low-income families.

In a city with an ever-increasing cost of living, rent controlled housing is one of the few avenues in which long-term residents can afford to continue living in the city. We recognize Supervisor Melgar's amendment exempting properties with 3+ units from use of the HC-SF program, as a step in the right direction, but hundreds of tenants in 2-unit properties remain at risk. While we appreciate the work that Supervisors Melgar and Chen have done to advance protections through the Tenant Protections and Demolitions Ordinance, loopholes such as Ellis Act evictions and the continued inclusion of 2-unit rent-controlled buildings in the upzoning plan leave many tenants vulnerable and unprotected. We ask

that all existing rent-controlled housing be exempt from the HC-SF program. This does not bar property owners from using programs like SDB and therefore should not be considered a constraint on development.

We also ask that form-based density is removed from the base zoning because when it is coupled with the HC-SF program or SDB, the potential for large profits may increase the risk of speculation.

The two aforementioned points are especially important in the context of the PEGs "comprised of areas or neighborhoods with a higher density of vulnerable populations," and where there has been a history of displacement. These areas typically have a high percentage of renters, many of which live in rent-controlled housing. Section 249.97 of the San Francisco Planning Code states "the City needs to expand permanently affordable housing investment" in these areas. This plan does not have a tangible affordable housing plan but rather functions merely as a market-rate housing initiative.

Relying on market-driven development and a 15% inclusionary requirement—most of which serve households between 55% and 200% of AMI—does not constitute an affordable housing strategy. The City's RHNA goals include the production of approximately 46,000 low- and moderate-income units. As it stands, there is no substantial plan to meet that goal. Units that are not deed-restricted affordable will ultimately be unaffordable to the lowest income folks. So, we ask that the PEGs be removed from the plan, per Supervisor Chen's amendment, and that the Board create true affordable housing solutions in the PEGs, and citywide.

We want to be explicit that we are not against building more housing, but the housing we build should be affordable to the communities we serve, existing community members and small businesses should have the right to remain in their neighborhoods, and units should suit the needs of everyday families.

Sincerely,

Rosa Chen

Director of Programs – Planning & Policy

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | SON-SF SaveOurNeighborhoodsSF |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Zou, Han (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); SherrillStaff; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | INTERIM D4 SUPERVISOR |
| **Date:** | Friday, November 14, 2025 1:48:37 PM |

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF were very disappointed in the most recent appointment of Isabella "Beya" Alcaraz especially in-light of all the negative issues surrounding her business & personal life. *But, we are pleased that she resigned at your request!*

However, this once again leaves District 4 with NO representation that the community had any input on.

We would like to recommend that a Town Hall be held ASAP & all constituents should be invited to discuss this matter & make comment on.

Furthermore, in regards to the vote on **November 17th** at the Land use & Transportation Committee Hearing, we feel that as once more D4 has no representation to submit constituents suggested Amendments regarding the Family Zoning Plan. We feel it's necessary & appropriate to postpone this hearing & others until we have an Interim D4 Supervisor to voice our needs & concerns.

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
Co-Founders
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF
sonsf.org

**From:** Holden Weisman
**To:** MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
**Cc:** Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco Letter of Support for the Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Friday, November 14, 2025 1:07:34 PM
**Attachments:** Outlook-fthsxqxz2.png
Habitat GSF Letter of Support for FZP 11142025.pdf

---

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

Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please accept the attached letter of support from Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco relating to the Family Zoning Plan - Items 4 through 7 on the November 17, 2025 meeting agenda of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. If you have any questions or would like to follow up, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Thank you,
Holden Weisman

Holden Weisman | Director of Policy and Advocacy
He / Him / His
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
300 Montgomery Street, Suite 450, San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 907-4435
• https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.habitatgsf.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZGU4ZmMyM2M1NDY5NzljYWYxZGEyZDA2OWJiMTY0ZTo3OmFkZjU6MDQ2ZDk2YmE3NWNiNjM2YzJmM2FkODJmMzBjZmYwN2MxYzFjMTFmYTQzNzk0M2Q5MmNhYWU5NWFlZWY5OTI5NTp0OlQ6Tg
• @Habitatgsf

We build and sustain affordable homeownership opportunities for families in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin counties.

Book time to meet with me

Habitat for Humanity®
Greater San Francisco

November 14, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Melgar,

On behalf of Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco (Habitat GSF), I would like to once again share our support for the Family Zoning Plan, including recent amendments. We believe the Family Zoning Plan will set San Francisco on a realistic path toward addressing the city's housing needs and will allow Habitat GSF to more effectively produce homes that fulfill these needs. We encourage you to vote to recommend the necessary legislation as amended to the full Board of Supervisors for consideration.

Habitat GSF builds homes and sustains affordable homeownership opportunities for families across San Francisco. However, our ability to continue to produce the kinds of 100% permanently affordable multiunit homes for ownership is increasingly limited to relatively few neighborhoods that meet our zoning needs. We also face the challenge all affordable homebuilders must grapple with – scarce availability of affordable land. Without such properties we will be further constrained from producing homes that would allow our homeowners to plant generational roots in well-resourced and transit-rich neighborhoods.

The Family Zoning Plan will open many more doors for Habitat GSF homeowners by dramatically increasing the number of zoned areas that would better meet our financial needs to produce more permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in every district. Further, the inclusion of Supervisor Chen's amendment to grant qualified nonprofits the first right of refusal for sales of property within the SFMTA SUD is invaluable and critical to making the kinds of developments we produce significantly more feasible.

It is for these reasons and for our strong conviction that homeownership is transformative for families' health, education, and building of generational wealth, that we ask that you recommend the Family Zoning Plan as amended to the full Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions or would like to follow up on these comments, please reach out to me directly at hweisman@habitatgsf.org. Thank you on behalf of Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco and our future San Franciscan homeowners.

Sincerely,

Holden Weisman
Director of Policy Advocacy
Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco
hweisman@habitatgsf.org

Cc: Supervisor Chyanne Chen

Supervisor Bilal Mahmood

John Carroll, Clerk

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 13 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, November 13, 2025 12:18:51 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 13 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf |

Hello,

Please see attached 13 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** Maren Vanderkolk
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:30:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maren Vanderkolk
mvanderkolk10@gmail.com
2250 Bay St
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Kayla Cranshaw-Craig
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:41:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kayla Cranshaw-Craig
kacranshawcraig@gmail.com
1242 34th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** danfoldes@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:37:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dan

danfoldes@gmail.com
1430 Cole St Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Monica Moore
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2025 4:45:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a concerned constituent, I do not agree that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is the antithesis of serving the San Franciscan public.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units.

I am requesting that you vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.

I am requesting that you require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Please truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Developers must be required to provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in our Mayor's Plan.

Given climate change, it is essential that the public access to our waterfront and environment be protected, especially for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Monica Moore

Monica Moore
monica1973moore@icloud.com
23 Mirabel Ave, # B
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** Margo Aparicio
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, November 6, 2025 10:40:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
As a below median income renter, I can only say this proposal to displace people in rent

controlled properties is an invitation to force tax paying tenants and families to leave San Francisco. Affordability is far more important an issue over high rent towers that like our own downtown will be riddled with empty apartments most people can't afford. Times are tough, so rather than increase homelessness with Mayor Lurie's proposal, please look alternatives.
Has demolishing empty or near empty downtown office high rises buildings for high rise apartments even been considered? I'm not talking office building conversion, but instead NEW housing! You won't be displacing rent controlled units, the skyline won't change drastically, and more housing will be available without additional use of land space.
Sincerely,
Margo Aparicio

Margo Aparicio
margo21st@gmail.com
228 Duncan Street #202
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:00:55 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
592 Pennsylvania Avenue
San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** Michael Taylor
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:45:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Taylor
Nob Hill
San Francisco, CA

Michael Taylor
PHATMICHAELT@GMAIL.COM
1201 California St
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** maxbmargolis@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:56:37 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Max Margolis

maxbmargolis@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Tom Zimberoff
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:14:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tom Zimberoff
tom@zimberoff.com
1364 45th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Michael Nguyen
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 2:39:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Nguyen
mike14780@gmail.com
785 Burnett Ave , #8
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** LissaIvy Tiegel
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 1:08:27 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

LissaIvy Tiegel
tinydiagram@gmaiL.com
201 Roanoke Street, 1a
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Jonathan Hsieh
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 10:36:29 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jonathan Hsieh
jzhsieh@gmail.com
1688 PINE ST, UNIT W404
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Cody Vaughn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 1:00:24 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cody Vaughn
vaughnburger01@gmail.com
1451 Guerrero St, Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94110-4360

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 20 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073 |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, November 12, 2025 3:23:01 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 20 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf |

Hello,

Please see attached 29 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** Matthew Castillon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, November 9, 2025 2:56:49 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Matthew Castillon
mcastillon10@gmail.com
550 Battery St
San Francisco, California 94111

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Eric Brooks |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Nov 3 Amendments Not Enough! Replace Mayor"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 10, 2025 8:53:45 PM |

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

Hi again Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. **And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.**

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put

almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks
Our City SF
San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

http://our-city.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Teresa Palmer |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:00:30 AM |

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

**Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie's Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701**

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public

hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer M.D.

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathryn Hyde |
| **To:** | Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov |
| **Subject:** | housing SF |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:50:24 AM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind
- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like ares that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

Kathryn Hyde | 415.359.7971 | IG @reenvisionrepair |
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.reenvisionrepair.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NWYyNGNiZmQ1YTZhY2YwMjUwMDE5YzkzZTk4MTRlMjo3OmQ5Nzg6ZjM5MmFmZGJkYTVkZjk5ZTQ0MDA3M2QyNzI3YjAwYjEwNWVjYTc5YWEzYzNiMDVmOTQxYjdlNmM0ODhkYjUzMDp0OlQ6Tg

**From:** Alan Billingsley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:27:13 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alan Billingsley
alanbillingsley215@gmail.com
215 Eureka St
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** Anthony Criscione
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Support Family Zoning-San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:31:50 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anthony Criscione
acriscione1997@gmail.com
145 San Jose Ave
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** Phillip Raffle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:59:31 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Phillip Raffle
phillip.d.raffle@gmail.com
1466 Dolores Street
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Marty Cerles
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 12:01:06 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Marty Cerles
martycerles@gmail.com
2940 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Julia Diaz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:44:32 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Julia Diaz
jmdiaz2016@g.ucla.edu
3841 24th st
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** Todor Markov
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 2:57:42 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I've called San Francisco home since 2017. I live in Rincon Hill, and I'm writing to voice my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.
I've watched this city change over the past eight years, and one thing has become crystal clear: we need more housing. I've seen friends leave because they couldn't afford to stay. I've watched young families struggle to find space to grow. And I've seen how the lack of housing options makes this city less accessible to the people who make it vibrant and diverse.
That's why I support the Family Zoning Plan. This isn't just policy to me—it's about making sure San Francisco remains a place where everyone can afford to live, not just the wealthy. I want more homes in Rincon Hill and across the city. I want my neighbors to be able to build in-law units for aging parents or backyard cottages for adult children. I want teachers, artists, service workers, and young professionals to have a real shot at living here.
This plan gives families flexibility and expands housing choices in the neighborhoods where people actually want to live—near transit, jobs, and schools. It's a positive step toward a more livable, affordable, and inclusive San Francisco.
I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan. Let's build a city where everyone can belong.
Thank you for listening.
Sincerely,
Todor Markov

Todor Markov
todor.m.markov@gmail.com
301 Main Street #32F
San Francisco, California 94105

**From:** Justin Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:21:07 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Patrick Le
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:39:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more housing, and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

Let's build a San Francisco that will continue to grow and where everyone can belong. It just makes sense to build more housing. More people, more revenue from taxes and local businesses to fund essential services. Why do we want the population to shrink and still have it be so expensive to live here? Please do the right thing.

Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St.
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Annette Billingsley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 5:43:55 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Annette Billingsley
ab94115@gmail.com
2821 Pine Street
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Meghan Warner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 6:32:29 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Best,
Meghan Warner, PhD
D4 Resident

Meghan Warner
meghanowarner@gmail.com
2610 47th ave
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Paul Foppe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:52:15 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,
As the middle of a sandwich family raising a first grader while taking care of a mother-in-law with alzheimer's dementia, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We need more housing of all types for all income levels for renters and for purchase.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us forward. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Paul Foppe
hugfoppe@gmail.com
2301 Lincoln Way
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

**From:** Alex Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:11:39 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

Last Tuesday's elections in NJ, VA and NYC only reinforced an issue that has plagued San Franciscans for decades: the issue of affordability.

When the most expensive expense of any person's paycheck is housing, we have to build much more homes if we have any hope of reining in costs.

The Family Zoning Plan will expand housing choices across the city, especially near transit, jobs, and schools.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alex Wong
mr.alexander.wong@gmail.com
1539 24th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Lisa Zahner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 9:02:37 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Lisa Zahner
lisa@cityrealestatesf.com
348 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bruce Wolfe N6BMW |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | URGENT! Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:29:06 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as

possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Bruce

94117

**From:** Maika Pinkston
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:43:06 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Maika Pinkston

Maika Pinkston
maikapinkston@gmail.com
37 Commer CT. #329
San Francisco, California 94124

**From:** Edward Sullivan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 2:40:20 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Edward Sullivan
efsullyjr@aol.com
2448 Great Hwy Apt 14
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Bruce Wolfe N6BMW
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
**Subject:** URGENT! Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
**Date:** Wednesday, November 12, 2025 12:29:03 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as

possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Bruce

94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Woody LaBounty |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); isabella.alcaraz@sfgov.org; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Land Use Mtg on 11/17: SF Heritage Supports Supervisor Chan"s Amendments |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 11, 2025 6:46:24 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png<br>SFHeritage-SUPPORT-Chan-Amendments.pdf |

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

SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by, and our conversations with, Mayor Lurie and

President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,

Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

SF HERITAGE

*Woody LaBounty*
*President & CEO*
*he/him/his*

**SAN FRANCISCO HERITAGE**
**On Unceded Ramaytush Ohlone Land**
**HAAS-LILIENTHAL HOUSE**
**2007 FRANKLIN STREET**
**SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109**
**P: 415.441.3000 x 104**

***www.sfheritage.org***
**wlabounty@sfheritage.org**

Join Heritage Now

SF HERITAGE
www.sfheritage.org
2007 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
415 441 3000

November 12, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar, Supervisors Chyanne Chen and Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISOR CHAN'S AMENDMENTS
November 17, 2025 - Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of our citywide constituency, San Francisco Heritage submits our strong support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, consistent with the adopted Housing Element, for the treatment of historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan as set forth File No. 251073 as follows:

> On Page 12, Lines 13-24; and Page 30, Lines 17-25: "or substantially alter a historic resource that is: designated as a landmark or listed as a contributor to or located within a historic district under Article 10; listed as a Significant or Contributory Building under Article 11; listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places; or, located within an historic district that is listed in, or identified in an adopted survey or historic context statement as potentially eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places;

The current Family Zoning Plan includes significantly greater impacts to designated and potentially eligible historic and cultural resources than anticipated by the 2022 Housing Element and the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Absent Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments, we believe that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"), rather than the Addendum, is warranted to analyze the Family Zoning Plan's impacts to San Francisco's historic and cultural resources.

We have appreciated the attention given by and our conversations with Mayor Lurie and President Mandelman on how we can address protections for historic resources in the Family Zoning Plan. Supervisor Chan's proposal conforms with standard historic preservation practices, and we believe offers the best path forward to ensure San Francisco's special places are preserved in our changing and growing city.

Sincerely,



Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
wlabounty@sfheritage.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathryn Hyde |
| **To:** | Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Raayan.Mohtashemi@sen.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); radhika.gawde@sen.ca.gov |
| **Subject:** | housing SF |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 11, 2025 7:50:22 AM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

- We do not have the infrastructure, police force, roads, parking and water to support this plan.
- Structures should be limited to 5 stories to preserve lighting and wind
- We are only 7 x 7 square miles. SF is not like ares that have space
- Concerns about earthquakes
- There is space to build on vacant lots, Walgreens sites, 7/11 on Clment/9th Ave., etc.
- No buildings close to the shoreline
- We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Thank you!

Kathryn Hyde
130 Frederick St SF 94117

Kathryn Hyde | 415.359.7971 | IG @reenvisionrepair |
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.reenvisionrepair.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpmZGY1NDI5NWVjZTU4NmFjODVkZWUyZTc0OTY4OTVkYzo3OjVmMWI6ZjY1NDE2ODMwNDEwNTUzOTZmMWE5NWY5NWZmODc5M2Q5NjNjZDY1MjNlNWFiNTY5NGQ4OWM4Y2EyOGZiZTQ3Mjp0OlQ6Tg

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Teresa Palmer |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, November 11, 2025 1:00:27 AM |

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

**Public Comment: Replace Mayor Lurie's Disastrous Zoning Plan With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701**

Dear Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public

hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer M.D.

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Eric Brooks |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Nov 3 Amendments Not Enough! Replace Mayor"s Disastrous Zoning Plan With Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 10, 2025 8:53:45 PM |

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

Hi again Supervisors,

The amendments that were added on November 3rd to Mayor Lurie's so called 'housing plan' are not remotely enough!

The City Economist's report shows clearly that Lurie's plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 2 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the City's affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units. Together these are more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing approved housing permits, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year, in a way that will fully meet state mandates. **And make certain that all affordable housing produced fits the accepted definition of costing only 30% of the income of its residents.**

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put

almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in the Mayor's unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks
Our City SF
San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

http://our-city.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Romano |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Please vote no on Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan and replace It with a Real Affordable Housing Plan |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 4:05:25 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors, et al:

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you stop seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators. Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing.

Thank you,

David Romano
San Francsico CA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Elliot Helman |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:48:55 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Elliot Helman
Mission Bay SF 94158

**From:** David Kaskowitz
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:10:37 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to finally adopt a plan that effectively addresses the housing crisis in San Francisco. Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing, as the City Economist recently released report demonstrates.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz

306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** Jeanette Traverso
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** Fwd: A North Beach Resident"s Perspective on Upzoning
**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2025 5:55:34 PM

---

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

Hello, John. My apols for the typo in your email address. Pls see below. Many thx! Best, Jeanette

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Jeanette Traverso** <jeanettetraverso@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Nov 5, 2025 at 5:47 PM
Subject: A North Beach Resident's Perspective on Upzoning
To: <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>, connie.chan@sfgov.org <connie.chan@sfgov.org>, <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>, <stephen.sherrill@sfgov.org>, <danny.sauter@sfgov.org>, <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>, matt.dorsey@sfgov.org <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>, <john.carrroll@sfgov.org>

Hello. My name is Jeanette Traverso. I attended the 11/3/25 Land Use & Transportation Committee hearing for 3.5 hours last Monday, but had to leave before I could give my public comments on upzoning. Please see my perspective below:

My Italian relatives have lived in North Beach for generations. I am one of ten children, & the first & only one of ten to graduate college. I went on to get a law degree from Hastings, now UC Law SF.

Thirty years ago, my husband & I researched neighborhoods throughout San Francisco & chose North Beach for its walkability, identity & waterfront.

We strived to buy a three-unit residential building on Francisco @ Grant, and have lived in one of the units ever since. It's where we raised our two sons.

I have spent decades walking from North Beach to work at a law firm downtown. I still walk through the neighborhood daily & it always gives me a renewed sense of well-being when I walk down Grant & see the water before me.

I recently hosted a sister from the beautiful state of Hawaii, & she was awed by all the charming nooks & crannies of our incredible North Beach neighborhood.

I am in favor of affordable housing, but the proposed upzoning plan is misguided. It will allow speculators to build tall buildings for the rich. It will ruin the beloved character of the neighborhood. It WILL NOT create affordable housing. Hence, there is no good reason to destroy the low-rise, historic architecture of our coveted neighborhood. We all can see that modern high rises on Columbus shadowing the streets, or soulless buildings dwarfing Coit Tower, will be devastating. Likewise, it will be a travesty to allow formula retail to replace our unique cafes, restaurants, clubs & shops.

We have lots of empty commercial buildings throughout the City. We should get creative & convert these underutilized resources to affordable housing.

I am informed that Supervisor Sauter unilaterally put North Beach on the upzoning map, without adequate input from his constituents. This makes me irate.

I urge that the North Beach neighborhood be removed from the upzoning map, so that we can preserve this incredible neighborhood for those of us here today, & for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best, Jeanette Traverso

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 29 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073 |
| **Date:** | Friday, November 7, 2025 10:38:21 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 29 Letters Regarding the Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 29 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 1:11:22 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Don't ruin the neighborhoods by turning them into downtown!

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 1:49:16 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel

**From:** peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 2:53:44 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No Bulldozers! Historic buildings Must Be Preserved! We will Never build beautiful Victorians again!
And Protect Rent Controlled Buildings! Half of SF Needs These!
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** johnmclemore@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John McLemore
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 2:57:30 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a SF resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary Jan 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use—going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
John McLemore
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jillkb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 3:01:27 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Schmoe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 3:03:38 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Joe Schmoe
93123

**From:** jnsjl65@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jim Kilton
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 3:06:05 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jim Kilton
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** joeaschmoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Schmell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 3:13:01 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident, I strongly oppose Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters & small businesses & transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back Lurie's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to SF's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition & luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers & billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning—it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
I am outraged at the proposed upzoning all over SF. The proposed height increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character & charm of SF.

I want to specifically address my neighborhood, Aquatic Park/Fisherman's Wharf & how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65+ feet would be devastating to these neighborhoods.

If you love SF at all, you love the iconic hills & priceless beauty of our waterfront rising dramatically from the Bay waters & seemingly all the way to the clouds. Our waterfront is what songs, poems & movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships & Bay cruises & locals from private watercraft. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills & alternatively from land our breathtaking SF Bay, were nearly completely obliterated by skyrises, like the horrendous Fontana buildings, nicknamed the "buck teeth" by all locals not selfish or affluent enough to live in them. These types of Miami-style towers were initially planned to encase the entire northern coastline of SF, effectively creating a "wall on the waterfront."

Additionally, I have not heard a single authority figure involved with the disastrous upzoning "plan" address the ramifications of extreme upzoning creating wind tunnels or light shadows, a serious issue in the recent overzealous, overbuilding around NYC's Central Park where it is killing trees, plants, grass & wildlife either from being scorched by refractions or by lack of sunlight. Or that the overdevelopment in NYC has created a massive "land grab" wars over air rights, which allows developers the "right" to build even higher than the original zoning would have allowed & charge renters even higher premiums. Nor have I heard anyone provide any consideration to the FACT that SF exists in a dangerous earthquake zone & how building higher is a VERY risky endeavor on our steep hills. All I've heard from politicians & developers is "build, build, build." There seems to be no care, no consideration, no foresight for ANY long-term consequences. Take HEED & LEARN from the colossal mistakes of other cities, like NYC & Vancouver.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made SF arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let “NOT-MY-MAYOR” Lurie’s SHAMEFUL, LAND-GRAB, DEVELOPER-ENRICHING, SHORT-SIGHTED, UNINFORMED, DISASTOROUS "plan," destroy the very thing that makes SF iconic—its landscapes & views, by obliterating them with obtrusive, obstructive, unnecessary & unjustified skyrises.

Why are we here again?! I have only 1 conclusion—GREED. This is NOT about building more housing, affordable housing or benefitting communities. Its only intention is to make money for those in power & for the people in the pockets of or influencing those in power. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Joe Schmell
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lupe Velez |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 3:19:33 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

--

**Guadalupe Velez**
*Communications Director*
(She/Her/Hers)
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-3740 x305

**From:** kzhuravleva@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karina Zhuravleva
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 5:56:43 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karina Zhuravleva
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Caizhuming888@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zhu ming Cai
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, November 4, 2025 10:07:07 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Zhu ming Cai
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** ms.pedroni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lilianna Pedroni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2025 8:56:24 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I grew up in North Beach and continue to live here with my family. I'm writing to express concern about proposed changes that could alter the character of this neighborhood. Please preserve North Beach's authentic architecture and avoid turning the waterfront into a wall of tall, generic buildings. The views, historic charm, and human scale are what make this area special—and what draw visitors to it in the first place.

Rather than large-scale redevelopment, what this neighborhood truly needs is improved public transportation access. Enhancing connectivity would benefit both residents and visitors while maintaining the integrity of North Beach's unique identity.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Lilianna Pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2025 1:33:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. Democracy in matters such as this no longer exists in San Francisco. Instead we have "citizens united" on full display. If allowed to proceed unhindered, the end result will be a clear definition of SOCIAL CLEANSING.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Heisler
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** margsmay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margot May
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2025 7:38:40 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margot May
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** rekathryn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn Hyde
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 6, 2025 7:31:43 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long time reident of the Richmond and Cole Valley neighborhoods, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

I believe in affordable housing - there are many vacant lots and old buildings were housing could be added (or refurbished) - limit to 5-6 stories to preserve SF.

SF does not have enough police patrol, water, grocery stores in needed areas, parking, and MUNI lines to support 100,000 more residents.

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Hyde
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** terridaysf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terri James-Day
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, November 6, 2025 10:12:54 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terri James-Day
San Francisco, CA 94112

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Woo |
| **To:** | Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Raquel Redondiez; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | SOMA Pilipinas Letter RE "Family Zoning Plan" |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 12:42:28 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SOMA Pilipinas Letter_Family Zoning Plan 11.3.25.pdf |

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board, please see our letter below regarding the "Family Zoning Plan."

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and

speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

--
David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District

PILIPINAS

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

**From:** molinelli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Molinelli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:09:40 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Chan, Planner Chen and other elected officials,

I am a third generation San Franciscan. I live in my grandparents home off of Clement Street. In fact my Italian grandfather washed every window on every storefront on Clement. I chuckle every summer at the tourists eating at our amazing restaurants and coming to walk in Mountain Lake Park and see our neighborhood. I also am amazed at the thriving small businesses, diversity of income and cultures of our neighborhood and multigenerational families who can only afford to live in San Francisco because of THIS neighborhood. I myself, run a small non-profit that serves underserved communities with music, arts and education programming. I work often with districts like SFUSD, Daly City and OUSD.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I am deeply aware of the complex issues but I also have witnessed the history of corruption and developers who promise low-income housing but then somehow it's never enough. Until you can answer why we aren't filling the vacancies in the overflow of luxury housing that already exists in this city and repurposing what we ALREADY have I will not support this demonization of the low and middle class who are trying to survive.

You will demolish what makes San Francisco great and not solve the problems. We read about solutions from the long-term low income housing groups in San Francisco and not from YIMBY which is funneling money from developers and a high powered group of business owners and weaponizing grassroots organizing. This is not the way.

Talk to your small business associations, talk to your communities and please serve the people who live here as well as those who want to live here. Right now it is clear the people who want to make money are being served by using divisive words that tear our communities apart.

I work with teachers, families and the constituents you these developers say they will serve. Families who have working parents, uber drivers, food-service workers, health care workers - with small kids - they need parking and housing and there is housing to be had. Please answer why 15-20 percent of our luxury housing sits empty.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Molinelli
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Kaskowitz |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:10:34 AM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to finally adopt a plan that effectively addresses the housing crisis in San Francisco. Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing, as the City Economist recently released report demonstrates.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz

306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** parack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Arack
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 6:13:47 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

PARKING ONSITE IS ESSENTIAL!!!!!!
The lack of parking in these new hi rise buildings will have a chilling effect on the purchase or renting of these new units. Those who live in D4 know that a car is a necessity. If there is no parking the units will sit empty, like the eyesore on Sloat and 48th. Muni is inadequate and not safe. Bikes are no good for taking care of school, shopping, medical appointments. It is beyond foolhardy to eliminate on site parking. PEOPLE NEED THEIR CARS OUT HERE AND  NEW BUILDINGS NEED PARKING!!!! LISTEN TO D4!!

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patricia Arack
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane E Smalley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, November 2, 2025 7:10:33 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jane E Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of diana giampaoli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:37:26 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

HOW COULD YOU ALLOW ONLY 3 STORIES IN THE PRESIDIO AND BUILD OVER 3 STORIES ON LOMBARD. THIS IS INSANE. NOTHING SHOULD BE OVER 4 STORIES ON LOMBARD. PLEASE LISTEN TO US AND NOT THE BUILDERS WHO ARE IN EVERYONES POCKETS. THIS WILL BE HIGH RENTS AND WON'T WORK. WHY DON'T YOU BUILD ON CALIFORNIA STREET THE OLD FIREMANS FUND BUILDING AND CPMC CALIFORNIA CAMPUS. THERE IT WOULD WORK. IT CAN BE LOTS OF HOUSING. BUT MY VIEW IS EVERYONE IS IN EVERYONES POCKETS.....

Sincerely,
diana giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:53:44 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** jkj2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Quantz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:30:53 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors, which, if they don't sell, will become eyesores and attract the Wrong Crowd.

May I ask that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Larry Quantz
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:36:51 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 35 year resident of San Francisco and am absolutely disgusted that this destructive, ghastly upzoning plan is about to be pushed through with NO real democratic input and based on arbitrary building targets set by an unelected panel of ideologues. If you vote to approve this, as seems to be the foreordained result (as surely as Putin and Maduro, would "win" re-election tomorrow if a vote were held) you will have forfeited every shred of democratic legitimacy you might have left. Mayor Lurie can go down in history as man who destroyed this city of once legendary beauty and charm.

You claim "your hands are tied" by the all mighty Scott Weiner? You can't find the courage push back on a corrupt CA state senator, but yet you proudly "resist" President Trump's offer to deport the illegal Honduran drug dealers who have killed 4,300 San Francisco residents in this decade alone, something most San Francisco's want done? Shame on you. And, do you really think we the citizens are too stupid to see what is going on?

Legitimacy once lost will be difficult to restore.

Mayor Lurie and the Board of Super

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:41:32 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. So I urge you to:

1. Exclude parcels in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD.

2. Exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just 3.

3. Require all publicly owned parcels, like the SFMTA ones, to be 100% affordable housing.

4. Exclude all historic resources from the Upzoning Plan, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers.

5. Limit form-based density (density decontrol) and height increases to the Local Plan.

6. Require inclusionary affordable housing to be located on site or nearby within ½ mile of the development.

7. Ted Egan's report from the Controller's office says that housing will unlikely be built no matter what unless rents and sales prices rise. That's just now but well into the future. This plan is one created in quicksand,

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** pat.huey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Huey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:56:51 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This housing crisis is a myth from greedy real estate developers. We have plenty of housing. The Park Merced apartments have some 3200 apartments available. We have many in-law apartments that no one wants to rent out because small landlords have so few rights. For example, to evict an undesirable tenant, they must pay them $20,000. No small landlord can afford that.

Sincerely,
Patricia Huey
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** cbonavico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher Bonavico
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 11:58:33 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The proposed new heights along Lombard street are a horrible idea because 1) there is no planning for the additional traffic, 2) no planning for the water issues especially as area sewer pipe is in a terrible state of disrepair so adding new water stress will be a major negative factor, and 3) the plans proposed are for luxury condominiums - they certainly will not helping lower income individuals find housing. This appears to be a monetary windfall to the contractots and developers - and the public officials they donate to. Shame !

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christopher Bonavico
San Francisco, CA 94123

# Request for Notice and Community Feedback on Proposed Upzoning

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 NOV 03 PM03:36

## Background

The undersigned residents wish to formally express concern regarding the process surrounding the proposed upzoning within the Family Zoning Plan. To date, we have not received reasonable notice regarding this proposal, especially in terms of how it may affect our neighborhood. Furthermore, residents have not been provided with sufficient opportunity to offer meaningful feedback on the proposed changes.

### Neighborhood Boundaries

Our neighborhood encompasses the area extending from Van Ness Avenue to Polk/Larkin Streets, spanning from Pacific/Broadway to Greenwich. This includes prominent cross-streets such as Filbert, Union, Bonita, Green, and Vallejo. See MAP, attached

### Request for Information

We respectfully request the provision of detailed information addressing the potential impacts of the proposed upzoning, particularly concerning the Van Ness corridor and its immediate surroundings. Comprehensive data and clear communication are essential to enable residents to contribute informed perspectives and feedback before any final decisions are made regarding the Family Zoning Plan.

| Name | Address | Phone/email |
|---|---|---|
| Diane Joseph | 1436 Union St | 415-598-9641 djoseph@blackrock.com |
| Dennis Blum | 1438 Union Street | 415 577-2438 |
| JOAN ALBERTSON | 1438 UNION ST. | 415 3070938 |
| | | |
| MIRIAM KASDAN | 1440 Union St | 415-350-7591 |
| JOFF NOVICK | 1412 Union St. | 415 756-5710 |

| Name | Address | Phone/email |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cynthia Chin | 1414 Union St | 415-832-0450 |
| Janet Song | 10 BONITA ST | 650-201-8844 |
| CASSANDRA HARVELL | 2430 VAN NESS AVE | 510 910 1559 |
| Allison Bowden | 1770 Pine St | 850-443-2084 |
| Ronald Smith | 626 POLK ST | 415 441 7470 |
| Ruth Waddington | 1340 Clay St. | — |
| Deborah Birnbaum | 1950 Clay St. #204 | dlbirnbaum@yahoo |
| Meghan Ministeri | 1335 unions st #1 | 650 787 4841 |
| Lynn Ferrante (Lynn Ferrante) | 1335 UNION ST #7 | 4156011555 |
| Madeline Crowley | 2652 Polk #2 | 415-218-3250 |
| DONNA MARCHESANO | 1845 FRANKLIN ST #604 | 4158790952 |
| Allen Zigman | 1440 Union St | 4156522217 |
| Reed Connell | 1450 Taylor St | 510 387 7518 |
| Kristy Eiffert | 1455 Union St #12 | (661) 703-8672 |
| DAN KUPSCO | 1822 POWELL | 415.660.6424 |
| Zoe Jacobs | 400 Vallejo St. SF CA 94133 | (415) 706-6383 |
| Maggie Quinn | 733 Chestnut St. | 614-949-0732 |
| Ricky Mathew | " " | 707-484-6[illegible] |
| Monica Pelayo | 000 Chestnut | 650-796-6548 |
| David Rapp-Kirshner | 600 Chestnut | 315 915 9112 |
| Lisa Rude | 2656 Van Ness | 415-673-1773 |
| DAVID OH | 1440 union St APT 103 | 213-393-5744 |
| [illegible] | 1[illegible] St | 415-544-[illegible] |
| Andrea N. Grant | 2560 Polk St #4 | 917 715 5403 |

| Name | Address | Phone/email |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sebrina Lonergan | 2761 Van Ness | 8178210957 |
| [illegible] | 869 Hyde St #604 | watsonamy@mac.com |
| DAN KUWALSKI | 2355 Polk St. #206 | 516 812-1250 |
| Sara Draper | 1660 Sacramento St | |
| Karan Malhotra | 1080 Sutter St. #201 | 408-599-8040 |
| Jin Rickard | 1455 Vallejo St. | kinjojinzen@outlook.com |
| David Fine | 2 539 Polk SF CA | 323 [illegible] |
| Susan Ostermann | 2048 Polk St, # 212 | (628) 249-5594 |
| [illegible] | 1845 Walnut St. | 415-216-5449 |
| [illegible] | 1590 BROADWAY #226 | 415-517-2572 |
| Eldera Pedersen | 1458 Union St. SF, CA 94109 | 415-531-4022 |

| Name | Address | Phone/email |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Francell K. Haskins | 1335 Union St #6 | fran.kh@sbcglobal.net |
| MARIO RMZ | 1335 UNION #4 | 6509066729 |

# Proposed Zoning Map
# Local Program Heights
## DRAFT September 30, 2025

Board file 250700 v.3
Graphic Source: San Francisco Planning Department




### Proposed Local Program Height Limits

- 40' Local Program Height
- 50' Local Program Height
- 65' Local Program Height
- 85' Local Program Height
- 105' Local Program Height
- 120' Local Program Height
- 130' Local Program Height
- 140' Local Program Height
- 160' Local Program Height
- 180' Local Program Height
- 240' Local Program Height
- 250' Local Program Height
- 300' Local Program Height
- 350' Local Program Height
- 450' Local Program Height
- 490' Local Program Height
- 500' Local Program Height
- 650' Local Program Height

- Supervisor District
- Housing Opportunity Areas

NOTES:

In addition to heights shown here, the following lots get a minimum height of 65' through the Local Program: Lots 8,000sf or larger, and Corner lots.

All projects using the Local Program are subject to form-based density (ie density decontrol) regardless of height limit or underlying zoning district.

This map represents heights available to projects that opt into the Local Program. They are generally equivalent to heights projects may receive if using the State Density Bonus or other state bonus program.

0 0.5 Miles

LEARN MORE:
sfgov.org/sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan

**Comments to the Land Use Committee on November 3, 2025**
**Jessica Vistnes**

My name is Jessica Vistnes and I'm from District 2. I am speaking today in strong opposition to the current version of the proposed upzoning plan. I fully support more housing in my neighborhood – I just want it to be thoughtful and in scale.

I am distressed about the increased heights in many parts of District 2, but with only 2 minutes to speak I want to focus on the proposed zoning for 14-story buildings on Lombard Street, starting at Laguna and going east. This change in heights there seems to have only been added in 2025– and my understanding is that it occurred because heights were lowered at the west end of Lombard near the Palace of Fine Arts and as a result heights were simply popped up at the other end to 14 stories to maintain the count – which does not seem like a very thoughtful approach to rezoning Lombard Street.

My understanding from talking with Supervisor Sherrill is that he expects there might be potentially 10 14-story buildings on the three blocks of Lombard from Laguna to Franklin. Many people, even those in favor of the zoning

plan, view the Fontana Towers as eyesores. To me, 14-story towers on Lombard Street, while they are not 18 stories like the Fontana Towers, is just like putting possibly 10 eyesores in an area that would block some of the nicest views in San Francisco so only a privileged few can see them. And people living in the new luxury apartments on floors 7 through 14 of these towers are probably unlikely to be taking the bus on the transit friendly Lombard Street that is the reason for allowing such tall buildings there in the first place.

I live on Vallejo Street and have been paying attention, as I walk around, to the beautiful views at the intersections of Vallejo and Broadway Streets with Laguna, Octavia, Gough, and Franklin streets that would be OBLITERATED with such tall buildings. Apart from residents enjoying views of THE CITY BY THE BAY, there go views for the tourists as they walk around Pacific Heights or drive around in those cute little yellow cars. Lowering heights on three blocks doesn't seem like it would upset the apple cart for this plan with the state and I urge you to consider it.

I am submitting this letter with my public comments because I agree with the proposed revisions

Jessica Vistnes
District 2

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471136 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147

April 30, 2025

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Re: Proposed Revisions to the Upzoning Map to Reflect District 2's Community Planning, Safety, and Growth Objectives**

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

Thank you for your engagement with our neighborhood as we collectively work toward a vision of housing growth that respects San Francisco's history, diverse communities, scale, and distinctive public spaces.

As SF Planning continues to revise the proposed Upzoning Map, we request a series of specific, actionable changes critical to maintaining the identity, livability, and uniqueness of this part of San Francisco. We look forward to working with you to:

- Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco
- Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety
- Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors
- Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

This part of District 2 features some of San Francisco's most iconic landmarks—from the Bay and the Palace of Fine Arts to the Golden Gate Bridge. As drivers enter the city via the Presidio Parkway, they experience a rare blend of hillside housing and urban density, evoking the charm of Europe's great coastal cities. The combination of natural setting, architectural rhythm, and cultural legacy makes this area both a world-class tourist destination and a cherished residential neighborhood.

For over a century, development west of Van Ness has followed the city's natural topography, integrating the urban grid with the land's slope, sunlight, and airflow. This is no accident—it is the result of organic, community-guided planning. Taller buildings crown the hilltops, gradually stepping down to 40 feet as the land slopes toward the Bay. Where this balance has been ignored, the consequences have been damaging.

As the city updates its zoning map to meet housing goals, it has both the opportunity and the obligation to respect this historic, context-sensitive development pattern. A one-size-fits-all approach invites speculative land grabs, drives up land costs, and risks replacing community-serving homes and businesses with unaffordable, investor-driven development.

## Requested Map Changes & Policy Adjustments

### 1. Maintain Lombard Street as a Scenic Gateway to San Francisco

Lombard Street forms a gateway into San Francisco from the Golden Gate Bridge, framing iconic landmarks like the Palace of Fine Arts. Longstanding planning principles recognize that such landmarks must retain their visual prominence within the surrounding cityscape.

The proposed Upzoning Map undermines those principles by allowing buildings 6 to 8 stories tall—or more—immediately adjacent to or within the vicinity of lower-scale blocks and historic landmarks. These oversized structures, up to 100% larger than their surroundings, would crowd and compete with iconic features like the Palace of Fine Arts—a City Landmark that has long defined San Francisco's northern waterfront. Its visual stature depends on a built environment that respects both scale and setting. A blunt, uniform upzoning to 85 feet disregards topography and erodes the historic character that makes this area both livable and globally recognized.

We recommend a tapered height approach: 40 feet near the Palace, rising gradually to 50 and then 65 feet approaching Van Ness. This reflects the area's historical development pattern and ensures a balanced transition from the waterfront to the city's interior.

**Recommended Height Limits:**

- Limit building height to 40' on Richardson Avenue and on Lombard Street (starting at the Lombard Gate) to Webster Street
- Allow gradual increases beyond Webster to Van Ness:
    - 50' between Webster and Gough
    - 65' between Gough and Van Ness

This part of San Francisco — including Cow Hollow, the Marina, and Pacific Heights — has been assigned thousands of new units of housing capacity through broad density decontrol and increased height allowances, all contributing to the state's RHNA targets. It is more than our fair share in one of the city's most densely populated neighborhoods. These policies, when done properly, could enable new growth by allowing duplexes, triplexes, and small multi-unit buildings across the neighborhood.

In addition, Lombard is home to many small, independent motels dating back to the era of the Golden Gate Bridge — a rare remnant of San Francisco's history of welcoming visitors within neighborhood settings. Lombard is one of the last Motorways in the country that captures that hope-filled era of travel in mid-century America, rebuilding after World War II. These motels provide reasonably priced rooms and proximity to a major tourist destination, and support for our local businesses. Several of these motels have already been converted to student housing for the Academy of Art University. Losing others will result in losing tourism to our community and neighborhoods.

These recommendations align with the Planning Department's stated goals under the General Plan to preserve neighborhood character, maintain economic diversity, and enhance citywide view corridors.

## 2. Protect Existing Housing and Prioritize Safety

Lombard Street already has many residents living in rent-controlled apartments. These homes are essential to neighborhood stability and affordability, and support a vibrant mix of retail, services, and housing. Let's ensure long-time tenants in older rent-controlled buildings will not be quietly displaced through buyouts and demolitions.

As the upzoning plans allowed for more residents, we need to ensure the safety of those residents. The Planning Department must consider the serious risk of liquefaction in these areas. Much of the low-lying Marina and Cow Hollow was built on infill and remains vulnerable to seismic activity.

Aside from Lombard being a liquefaction zone, fire response time is a consideration. Cow Hollow boasts a newly rebuilt fire station on Greenwich Street. However, the fire truck ladders at this station can only service buildings as tall as 6-7 stories. If the building heights nearby are raised to 85' or taller, trucks must come from other neighborhoods, increasing the response time and endangering residents and visitors. This public safety issue has not been addressed anywhere in the city where buildings are proposed for drastic height increases.

These issues point to the need for thoughtful major corridor plans along not only Lombard, but Geary, 19th, and Taraval, among others, to ensure that urban planning practices can be implemented with the public input and care that went into the Market-Octavia or Central SOMA Plans of recent years.

## 3. Safeguard Neighborhood-Serving Retail Corridors

Chestnut, Union, and Fillmore streets are economic and cultural anchors. Their small-scale, sunlit retail corridors support thousands of jobs and contribute significantly to neighborhood livability and a large contingent of the city's 20+ million visitors that further contribute to supporting local employment and small businesses.

Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition—many of these buildings are historic one-story Art Deco structures that currently house thriving small businesses. These businesses will not survive the transition, and adjacent shops are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize entire commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life that make these neighborhoods work.

The Marina Safeway site is another concern. While redevelopment may be considered, its location and current use are vital for residents—especially seniors and families without access to private transportation. A high-rise would be inappropriate and disruptive in this context.

**Recommended Height Limits:**

- Limit height to 40 feet on:
    - Union Street
    - Chestnut Street
    - Lower Fillmore Street (within the Marina and Cow Hollow)
    - Upper Fillmore Street (from Jackson to Bush)
    - Safeway site (corner of Laguna and Marina Blvd)

## 4. Remove Density Decontrol Provisions

To promote transparency and encourage meaningful neighborhood engagement, urge SF Planning to update the current interactive Upzoning Map to clearly reflect the two key provisions. Most San Franciscans are unfamiliar with these kinds of online tools and may not realize they need to click the "Info" button in the left-hand legend to uncover the proposed changes.

Currently, if someone clicks on a corner lot within the density decontrol area, the map still shows a proposed height of 40 feet—rather than the actual 65 feet being contemplated. This creates confusion and obscures the true scope of the changes. Failure to make these provisions plainly visible may not meet the standards of procedural transparency or informed public review expected under CEQA and other land use statutes. Complete clarity is essential.

But clarity alone is not enough. These provisions are deeply flawed and should be removed:

**Recommended Changes:**

- **Remove the provision that allows 65' heights on corners lots.** This will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision.

- **Remove the provision that allows lots 8,000 sq. ft. or greater to automatically rise to 65'.** This provision encourages lot mergers that will invade the unique and vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in dense urban living.

## Conclusion

We support new housing through thoughtful, context-sensitive growth. Like the city, we believe in expanding housing opportunities through planning that respects topography, preserves neighborhood identity, and safeguards essential services.

This area has already added housing capacity through the 4- and 6-plex legislation led by Supervisor Mandelman and adopted in 2023. We welcome further improvements that recognize Lombard Street's role as a scenic gateway.

But the current map goes too far. It invites speculation, drives up land costs, and encourages the demolition of sound housing—quietly displacing tenants and small businesses in favor of unaffordable luxury towers. These are the very people and places that give our neighborhoods their life and character.

Incorporating the revisions we've outlined will build public trust, reflect sound planning, and reduce the risk of unnecessary conflict or delay.

We urge you to support a smarter, long-term strategy—one that protects what makes San Francisco unique: its layered history, diverse communities, small businesses, and walkable, human-scale neighborhoods that reflect generations of thoughtful planning—while ensuring that truly affordable housing is the outcome, not just the promise, of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc:
CHA Association Board and Membership
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
Rachael Tanner, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy, Planning Department
Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Planning Department

# Bellaire Tower Homeowners' Association

# 1101 Green St.

# San Francisco, CA 94109

Sent via E-Mail

October 31, 2025

San Francisco Mayor's Office
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Ned Segal
Chief Housing and Economic Development

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee
Meeting, November 3rd 1:30 pm
Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan

Dear Mayor Lurie, Chief Segal, and Board of Supervisors:

I write this letter on behalf of Bellaire Towers Homeowners' Association, 64 owners and residents of our 20 story historic high rise at Green and Leavenworth at the top of Russian Hill.

The original Family Zoning Plan heights for the six square blocks: Leavenworth on the east, Larkin to the west, Filbert to the north and Vallejo to the south maintained the current 40 foot height.

Without explanation or comment, in late 2024, the Family Zoning Plan Map increased zoning height in this six square block area from 40 feet to 65 feet.

We respectfully request the original Family Zoning Plan zoning height of 40 feet be reinstated for this six square block area.

Our request is modest and historically correct according to the Family Zoning Plan's own records.

There is substantial Russian Hill community support for retaining this 40 foot limit for this six block area.

On May 6, 2025, (attached)the 600 member Russian Hill Neighbors wrote the San Francisco Planning Department noting the unexpected reversal of the original Family Zoning Plan in the six block area, noting in the penultimate paragraph of their letter:

"Lastly, we were surprised to see that heights were increased from 4 to 6 storys in the approximately 6 blocks centered on Hyde and Union Streets shown in Area A. This appears to be a reversal from the outcome of several discussions we had with Planning on this issue. These blocks are similar in character to the adjacent multi-block areas of Russian Hill immediately to the north and east which remain at 4-5 stories. These are all finely-grained residential areas among the city's densest. As we had mentioned in earlier letters, the availability of "soft" parcels more likely to be candidates for development are extremely limited here, significantly reducing the benefit of any proposed height increases in these blocks. We support density decontrol here, but urge retaining the current 4-story limit in this area."[1]

---

[1] It is expected a representative of the separate and also largely representative Russian Hill Community Association will be present at this meeting in support of the reinstatement of the 40 foot zoning in the six block area.

There are at least three separate and compelling arguments from a land use perspective in retaining the 40 foot height limit in this six block area:

First, this zoning height increase in this six square block area will not lead to affordable housing. To the opposite, it will only lead to gross speculation by developers. Bellaire's representative, Rajan Edwards, so testified at the original SF Planning Commission hearing and the last Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing.

Second, this is an historic district and stable residential neighborhood. Specifically, to the immediate east of Bellaire Tower is the designated historic district, the "Paris Block" legacy residences that survived the 1906 earthquake. Bellaire Tower itself has already obtained an Historic Resource Evaluation and is seeking state and national landmark status with the noted preservation architects Page & Turnbull. Interspersed in the six block square area are other historic or historically evaluated residences. There is significant Russian Hill community support for designating the entire area down to Hyde street with its cable car route an historic district. This entire neighborhood should not be disturbed and irrevocably changed by prospective development.

Third, and finally, increasing the zoning height by 25 feet in this six block area, in all probability, makes no economic sense even to developers. Bellaire has consulted a number of established and knowledgeable developers in San Francisco, who inform us this marginal 25 foot zoning height increase makes no economic sense from a developer's standpoint, given the already high land acquisition cost and the marginal increase in density, making multi-family, as opposed to single family re-development a losing proposition.

I will be personally in attendance at the meeting and would like to testify and answer any questions on this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Niels L. Pearson

Niels Pearson

President,

Bellaire Tower Homeowners' Association

Encl.

RUSSIAN HILL
NEIGHBORS

May 6, 2025

Lisa Chen, Principal Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
lisa.chen@sfgov.org

Subject: **Comments on April 2025 Draft of Proposed Zoning Map**

Dear Lisa:

Building upon our meetings and reviews of last year's drafts of the rezoning, we have reviewed the current iteration of April 2025. While encouraged that the current map reflects a number of our earlier comments, we have remaining concerns over what appear to be several reversals and height increases compared to the February 2024 draft.

We have consistently been supportive of reasonable density and height increases along main commercial and transit corridors, including Van Ness Ave. and Polk St. We are pleased to see that heights along upper- and mid-Polk St. have been limited to 8 stories, as we had recommended, rather than the 14 stories originally proposed that we felt were excessive. However, along Van Ness, heights have grown from 8 to 14 stories at the intersection with Lombard St., and from 25 to 35 stories south of Broadway. We urge a much more gradual transition in these locations. Please see Areas C1 and C2 on the attached map.

Closer to the waterfront, we were gratified to see the blocks along Bay St. reduced from 6 to 4-stories, as we had requested. However, the blocks north of North Point remain at 6-stories which we find problematic as they include Ghirardelli Sq. and are adjacent to Aquatic Park, as shown on Area B in the attachment. We recommend retaining the 4-story limit here.

Lastly, we were surprised to see that heights were increased from 4 to 6 stories in the approximately 6 blocks centered on Hyde and Union Streets shown in Area A. This appears to be a reversal from the outcome of several discussions we had with Planning on this issue. These blocks are similar in character to the adjacent multi-block areas of Russian Hill immediately to the north and east which remain at 4-5 stories. These are all finely-grained residential areas among the city's densest. As we had mentioned in earlier letters, the availability of "soft" parcels more likely to be candidates for development are extremely limited here, significantly reducing the benefit of any proposed height increases in these blocks. We support density decontrol here, but urge retaining the current 4-story limit in this area.

Thank you once again for considering our comments, and please let me know if you have any questions.

Cordially,
Carol Ann Rogers, President
president@rhnsf.org
415-902-3980

Attachments (2)

cc: Rich Hillis, Director rich.hillis@sfgov.org
Commission Affairs commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Supervisor Danny Sauter sauterstaff@sfgov.org
Supervisor Stephen Sherrill sherrillstaff@sfgov.org

*Russian Hill Neighbors ▪ 1819 Polk Street #221 ▪ San Francisco, CA 94109*

SAN FRANCISCO
**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

# Historic Resource Evaluation Response

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
**415.558.6378**

Fax:
**415.558.6409**

Planning
Information:
**415.558.6377**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Date* | September 28, 2015 |
| *Case No.:* | **2014-001259ENV** |
| *Project Address:* | **60 Russell Street** |
| *Zoning:* | RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family)<br>40-X Height and Bulk District |
| *Block/Lot:* | 0123/009 |
| *Staff Contact:* | Gretchen Hilyard (Preservation Planner)<br>(415) 575-9109<br>gretchen.hilyard@sfgov.org |

## PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

### Buildings and Property Description

The subject property, 60 Russell Street, is located on a rectangular-shaped lot measuring 20 feet by 60 feet on the north side of Russell Street, an alley located between Hyde Street and Eastman Alley in the Russian Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. The property is located within an RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The subject property is occupied by a one-story over raised basement, single family, wood frame residence constructed in ca. 1906. The residence was originally designed as a flat-front Italianate cottage that was very similar to 64 Russell Street—featuring the same side entry porch, projecting cornice, and façade configuration. Known alterations to the property include: relocation of partition walls, addition of two rooms and three exterior decks, window and door replacement, re-cladding the exterior in wood shingles, and replacement of wall boards and trim (1963); reroofing (1992); and dry rot repair (2006). Other alterations include removal of the period elements of the entry vestibule at an unknown date.

### Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property is considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to its age (constructed in ca. 1906).

On July 8, 2010, the Department issued a Historical Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) for a proposed project at 1945 Hyde Street (Planning Case #2010.0162E), which identified the subject block as part of an eligible historic district. The Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the project (by Kelley & VerPlanck, dated February 2010) found that Russell Street (from Eastman Alley to Hyde Street) contains "a high concentration of residential buildings constructed in the early years of reconstruction after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire...The buildings within this area are unified historically by theme and form, and therefore could be a potential district."[1] The subject property is located within the boundaries of this identified district. See evaluation section below for further analysis.

---

[1] Kelley & VerPlanck, Historic Resource Evaluation for 1945 Hyde Street, (February 2010).

### Neighborhood Context and Description

The subject property is located on a single-block alley on the western side of Russian Hill in San Francisco. The immediate context is characterized by primarily residential land uses with buildings dating from 1906 to the late-1920s. Buildings are generally one to three stories in height and some commercial properties are located along the major streets. The larger neighborhood is generally characterized by its steeply sloping terrain and a wide range of building types and styles dating from 1850-1930, with a scattering of more contemporary buildings throughout. While portions of the Russian Hill neighborhood have been surveyed as potential historic districts (specifically the older buildings at the top of the hill), the immediate blocks surrounding the subject property have not been formally surveyed.

### CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

**Step A: Significance**

*Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is "listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources." The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.*

| Individual | | Historic District/Context | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria: | | Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria: | |
| Criterion 1 - Event: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 1 - Event: | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| Criterion 2 - Persons: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 2 - Persons: | ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| Criterion 3 - Architecture: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 3 - Architecture: | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| Period of Significance: N/A | | Period of Significance: 1906-1911<br>☐ Contributor ☒ Non-Contributor | |

Based on the information provided in the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the subject property by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated June 2014), additional research by staff, and information found in the Planning Department files; staff finds that the subject building is eligible for inclusion on the California Register as a non-contributor to an eligible historic district under California Register Criteria 1 and 3.

**Criterion 1: Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.**

To be eligible under the event Criterion, the building cannot merely be associated with historic events or trends but must have a specific association to be considered significant.

According to the *Historic Resource Evaluation* prepared by Tim Kelley Consulting, Russian Hill first developed in late-19th century and many of its early residents were prominent members of the Bay Area's artistic, literary, artistic, and intellectual traditions. Early residents of Russian Hill included

Swedenborgian minister Joseph Worcester, architect Willis Polk, writer Gelett Burgess, photographer Dorothea Lane, and painter and poet Maynard Dixon.[2] The Russian Hill neighborhood was severely damaged by the 1906 Earthquake and Fire and all but a few buildings at the summit of the hill were destroyed. After this catastrophic event, residents quickly rebuilt and the subject property was constructed as part of the reconstruction effort that stretched from 1906 to ca. 1915. Many of the reconstruction-era buildings in Russian Hill were built quickly after the event to meet the high need for housing in San Francisco. The subject building did not individually contribute to the pattern of reconstruction of the Russian Hill neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire such that it would be individually eligible for listing in the California Register under this criterion. However, the building is part of a collection of buildings that represent this pattern of development and are more appropriately analyzed for eligibility as a historic district (see historic district evaluation below).

Staff finds that 60 Russell Street does not have a specific association with an event such that it would qualify individually under Criterion 1.

**Criterion 2: Property is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.**
Building permit records indicate that the original owners of 60 Russell Street were Ernest and Marguerite Guinard, who purchased the property in 1906 and sold it in 1911. The early owners and occupants of the subject property and neighboring properties on Russell Street were generally blue-collar workers (carpenters, laborers, etc). Records do not indicate that any of the owners or occupants of the subject property are important to local, regional or national past. Therefore, 60 Russell Street is not eligible under Criterion 2.

**Criterion 3: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.**
60 Russell Street is a one-story over raised basement, single family, wood frame residence originally designed as a flat-front Italianate cottage. The building was constructed in ca. 1906, at the beginning of the reconstruction of the Russian Hill neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The building retains its original form and some architectural features, such as the projecting cornice, but many of the exterior façade materials have been removed or were covered over by wood shingles in 1963.

Based on information outlined in the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the project (Tim Kelley Consulting, June 2014), and additional research by staff, the subject property at 60 Russell Street is not individually eligible for inclusion in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture), since the building does not possess high artistic value, nor individually embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction.

**Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**
The subject building is not significant under Criterion 4, since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type. Evaluation of archeological resources is outside of the scope of this review.

---

[2] Ibid, 5.

**Historic District Evaluation**

The subject property is part of a single-block alley of small-scale residential properties that are thematically and architecturally associated with the San Francisco's rebuilding after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The development of Russell Street followed a city-wide pattern of residential and commercial buildings construction spanning from 1906 to ca. 1915 to provide housing and services to displaced residents after the disaster. Today, Russell Street displays the architectural congruity necessary to qualify for listing under Criterion 1 (Events) representing a significant pattern of development after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The block is also eligible for listing under Criterion 3 (Design/Architecture) due to its high concentration of architecturally unified buildings with shared architectural characteristics, form, historic context and period.

Although a survey has not yet been completed, the boundaries of the historic district would include properties on both sides of Russell Street from Eastman Alley to Hyde Street. Based upon the historic context themes associated with the neighborhood, contributing buildings to the potential historic district would include intact multi- and single-family dwellings constructed on Russell Street between 1906 and 1911, the date the last reconstruction-era residence was completed on the street. As a result of this development pattern, there is a considerable degree of visual harmony among the residential properties along Russell Street and the buildings have experienced few exterior alterations. The building styles include Italianate, Classical Revival, Queen Anne, Craftsman, and Edwardian architectural styles. Most buildings still display a high level of historic architectural integrity; while there have been some alterations, the majority of the buildings still possess the basic form and architectural detailing associated with their style from the period of significance. The subject property was constructed during the period of significance, but due to exterior alterations, the building has lost integrity to this period and is considered a non-contributor to the eligible historic district.

***Note: The eligible Russell Street historic district has not been formally surveyed or evaluated. For the purposes of this HRER, the subject property at 60 Russell Street was examined for its possible contribution to the historic district and no other buildings within the district boundary were evaluated in detail.

**Step B: Integrity**

*To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's period of significance." Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Location:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | **Setting:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| **Association:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | **Feeling:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| **Design:** | ☐ Retains | ☒ Lacks | **Materials:** | ☐ Retains | ☒ Lacks |
| **Workmanship:** | ☐ Retains | ☒ Lacks | | | |

The street-facing façade of the subject property (60 Russell Street) has undergone many alterations since it was originally constructed in ca. 1906, including replacement of original wood-sash double-hung windows with aluminum sliders, reduction in the size of original window openings, removal of decorative window and door surrounds, modification of the projecting cornice detailing, and covering

the original horizontal wood siding with wood shingles. Although the original building form and scale are evident and some of the original cladding and trim materials may exist underneath the current cladding, in its current state, the building does not retain sufficient integrity to contribute to the eligible historic district.

**Step C: Historic District Character Defining Features**

For the eligible Russell Street Historic District, the character-defining features would include but are not limited to:

- Location on Russell Street;
- Residential use (single-family or multi-family flats);
- One-to-three story height;
- Wood frame construction;
- Lack of architectural bays (mostly flat facades facing alley with an occasional shallow angled bay);
- Raised basements;
- Horizontal wood cladding;
- Gable or flat roof forms;
- Elevated and recessed entries (some recessed entries feature decorative vestibule panels);
- Wood entry stairs;
- Queen Anne, Craftsman, Classical Revival, Italianate or Edwardian-era architectural detailing;
- Arched Classical Revival style entry surrounds with flanking columns or pilasters;
- Projecting, decorative wood window and door hoods;
- Flat or slightly molded wood board window and door surrounds;
- Wood-sash windows (double-hung and casement), some with multi-lite upper sashes and ogee lugs;
- Paneled and partially glazed wood entry doors;
- Projecting, denticulated cornices with square modillions; and
- Free-standing planter boxes or retaining walls in front setback, or no front setback.

## CEQA Historic Resource Determination

☒ Historical Resource Present
- ☐ Individually-eligible Resource
- ☐ Contributor to an eligible Historic District
- ☒ Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District

☐ No Historical Resource Present

## PART I: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: Tina Tam

Tina Tam, *Senior Preservation Planner*

Date: 10-5-2015

cc: Nicholas Foster, Current Planning

*GH: G:\Documents\HRER\60 Russell\HRER\60 Russell Street_HRER Part I.doc*

## IMAGES

Subject property looking northwest.
Image courtesy of Google Maps, 2015.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lupe Velez |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 3:19:24 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing oversupply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

--

**Guadalupe Velez**
*Communications Director*
(She/Her/Hers)
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-3740 x305

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Woo |
| **To:** | Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Raquel Redondiez; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | SOMA Pilipinas Letter RE "Family Zoning Plan" |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 12:42:26 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SOMA Pilipinas Letter_Family Zoning Plan 11.3.25.pdf |

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board, please see our letter below regarding the "Family Zoning Plan."

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and

speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

--
David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District

PILIPINAS

November 3, 2025

RE: Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan"

President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

SOMA Pilipinas, the Filipino Cultural Heritage District, is opposed to the proposed upzoning plan. The upzoning plan will lead to the displacement of residents and small businesses, and encourages real estate speculation, harming the South of Market and neighborhoods across the city. The current plan, coupled with numerous cuts to affordable housing and impact fees that have already occurred, highlight how the city's Housing Element and the state co-opt the language of racial and social equity to further deregulation. We are also opposed to the blatant giveaway in Western SOMA of mainly increasing base heights, which will be used with the state density bonus, resulting in basically two upzonings from this plan for SOMA.

We must instead prioritize developing 100% affordable housing, preserving and protecting existing housing, protecting existing residents and small businesses from displacement, and engaging in community based planning. The current upzoning is failing on these fronts. We support the amendments put forward by Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Chen as they constitute a logical baseline of what should be included in such a sweeping upzoning proposal.

The city's Housing Element, mandated by the state, calls for 57% affordable housing to be built. As there is no affordable housing component to this plan, it is clear that it is a market-rate housing plan. The city economist Ted Egan acknowledges that market-rate housing will not get built at the levels "required" by the state, because developers and investors can not get the profit that is desired from these projects, stating the plan will only produce 8,500-14,600 units over the next 20 years. Affordable housing developers, however, are ready and willing to build housing. According to the city's 2024 Housing Inventory Report, affordable housing production accounted for 64% of all new housing production in 2024; as market-rate housing stalled because of lack of return on investment, affordable housing production continued.

If the city and state are really concerned about "building housing," the focus would be on building affordable housing. However, it is clear that the real desire is not simply to "build housing," but instead to provide the best scenario for private developers, investors, and speculators to make money off of the real estate market in San Francisco.

We must focus on creating 100% affordable housing, protecting our neighborhoods that are composed of residents, small businesses, and neighborhood based organizations, and engaging in community based planning that focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

Thank you,

David Woo
Community Development and Policy Coordinator
SOMA Pilipinas

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | FW: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 12:12:18 PM |

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below communication regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org| www.sfbos.org

---

**From:** lgpetty <lgpetty@juno.com>
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:03 AM
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA's Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 37 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071 as of 11/3/25 12 noon |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 12:00:35 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 37 letters.pdf |

Hello,

Please see attached for 37 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written*

*or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** denniseblum@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Blum
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:19:35 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):My home as well as my rental unit on Union Street between Polk and Van Ness will be destroyed  and put in nearly constant shadow and darkness by the proposed towering height of the adjacent properties.

Sincerely,
Dennis Blum
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:00:12 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** sigimcc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:08:23 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** sigimcc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:08:57 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Ravit Shrivastav
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:30:11 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Ravit Shrivastav
ravitshrivastav@gmail.com
101 Rivoli Street
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:50:06 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

If one of these monstrosities goes up next door to us, we'll definitely leave. I won't live in the shadow of a high rise. We honestly bought our home because of all the light and the beauty of looking out at Golden Gate Park. So, our two little gardens and our tree (we call him Barkleaf) will die that will be the end of that. It just won't be the nice quiet neighborhood we planned to live in forever. We're getting ready to retire soon and really hope the city won't force us out to make room for rich folks' condos.

As a resident of the Richmond near Fulton St, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Lori Milburn
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 4:36:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Lori Milburn

Lori Milburn
lbzmilburn@gmail.com
2395 24th Ave. Apt. 4
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** soccercycle1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 6:35:17 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco person.,
As long as the affordable housing gets replaced it's ok. There's loads of free space by ccsf.

We call on you to:

- make the upcoming maps apparent and available for public viewing. People need to move in A fare amount of time. Keep doing a good job. Reviving market street will take some work. Don't drive out the poor responsible citizens. All those drugies have been the people that make the art you love so please some compassion. Not everyone has the tech skills to make it in computer software database world. The Loin knows it's time to mix it up and some of those 6 story buildings should have been 10 or higher. Don't forget to tell your mom you love her cuz she's old. Ok have a good day. It takes a lot of work for city that hits harder than its weight class. Keep the focus on the tourism that really separates it from other places, ooh and Sunday brunch.

Sincerely,
Mark Keith
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** yglaros@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of yvonne glaros
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:27:50 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
yvonne glaros
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:59:15 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Polesky
San Francisco, CA 94107

**From:** emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:36:38 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We must avoid repeating the past with this new version of Urban Renewal.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** thealohaangel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margo Goldman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 31, 2025 9:07:13 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in San Francisco for 55 years. I have worked to keep as much as possible the San Francisco charm. It is sad and disturbing that Mayor Lurie's plan has come about. The destruction to neighborhoods, victorians, and other beautiful San Francisco structures are getting torn down to put up which horrible, cooky cutter high-rise buildings....What for....there are many other areas where you could put up housing and create another new area...but why in already beautiful neighborhoods that do not need to be changed or congested.
I voted for you Mayor Lurie..and I am sadden by the turn you are taking...PLEASE STOP THIS CONGESTIVE BUILDING MADDNESS!

Cut back on all this rezoning, take more time to plan this out.
Stop this devastating change to our culturally beautiful San Francisco...
We do not need such a gross amount of Cookie Cutter Luxury Buildings..
Stop ruining our wonderful neighborhoods..

Consider looking at spaces to develop where there is more land and less residential structures
There is all that land by the old shipyards...why not create a new neighborhood there...

Sincerely,
Margo Goldman
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** R. Zierikzee
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 31, 2025 10:42:30 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

R. Zierikzee
inor@earthlink.net
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Eric Brooks |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 6:18:38 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' Ordinance and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing major greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks, Campaign Coordinator
Our City SF and San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

**From:** Ann Cabral
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Upcoming "Family Housing Zones" measure proposed by Mayor Lurie
**Date:** Friday, October 31, 2025 6:34:06 PM

---

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

I am not likely to be able to attend this coming Monday, 11/ 3/25 Board meeting where it is my understanding there will be discussions about the proposed changes to zoning in our Sunset district, as well as other neighborhood districts. I cannot stand for long periods, or crowded areas.

It is not acceptable for many of us living in single family, or in R2 zones, to have larger unit buildings and increased height permitted, especially when it increases demand on our very aged infrastructure and traffic management cannot be adapted. Many corner lots already have 3 or more stories, or even 4-5 stories on inner Sunset transit lines. A proposal to increase heights even further, demolish our outer neighborhoods to become more commercially profitable is not why we bought here almost 30 years ago. Sunset has become more crowded and traffic noticeably increased just in the past decade, especially with the Great Highway issues now added. The State may be pressuring San Francisco to build, build, build more housing capacity but it cannot be at the expense of destroying our neighborhoods. Keep the housing increases on already major commercial areas where one expects it to be. Don't take away the special uniqueness of the outer districts. There are already efforts to increase housing capacity even with our single family properties where "in law" units can be created more easily. We are not a metropolis like Los Angeles, San Diego, etc, where there was space to expand, and we do not want to become a "Malibu" of the north along the Great Highway.

This type of proposal to increase housing density is just not acceptable.

Regards, Sunset resident & tax payer, Ann Cabral

Sent from my iPad

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Francesca Pastine |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | SF Supervisors Support Mayor Lurie"s Affordable Housing and SF Neighborhoods Plan |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 7:35:00 PM |

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

Hello All,

As you may know, Mayor Lurie's *Family Housing Plan* will go before the Land Use & Transportation Committee this Monday, November 3, sometime after 2 p.m. I fully support this plan. It's time for San Francisco to take real steps toward building enough housing—especially in the low-density neighborhoods on the west side of the city.

While the City Economist, Ted Egan, recently noted that the plan alone will not meet the city's full housing mandates, it represents an essential step toward building the infrastructure we need for future growth.

Let's create a San Francisco where working-class families and future generations can afford to live and thrive.

Best,

Francesca Pastine

1183 Shotwell Street

415 596 5543

--
https://www.francescapastine.com/
www.pastineprojects.com
IN THE MAKE
http://francescapastine.blogspot.com
http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Magick Altman |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Family Housing |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 8:28:32 PM |

---

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

To whom in may concern, you can usually tell when something is against the people's interest when its called "Family planning". This is a scam to get quick approval of the destruction of our neighborhoods, affordable housing and protections for small businesses. North Beach is fine. LEAVE IT ALONE. There is purpose to the so=called red tape. To make sure the people win and not the developers, who could care less about our neighborhoods.
Stop this illegal and immoral action.
Be Leery of Lurie, Money doesn't talk it Swears.
Yours in Truth,
Magick Altman

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Todd |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 8:38:28 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

As a resident of San Francisco (District 2) and a stakeholder, I demand that you adopt a plan that prioritizes **affordable housing**!

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,
Todd Snyder
1941 Turk street Apt 4

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lgpetty |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:04:08 AM |

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate

Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

**From:** Judi Gorski
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chen, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Fariñas, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Engage, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosales, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sauer, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lauer, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Safai, Danny (BOS); SafaiStaff; Andrews, Michelle (BOS); AndrewsStaff
**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01:00 AM

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

**To:**
John.Carroll@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org ; Jen.Low@sfgov.org ; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org ; connie.chen@sfgov.org ; Frances.Wong@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org ; mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org ; Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org ; Jennifer.Farinas@sfgov.org ; FielderStaff@sfgov.org ; shamann.walton@sfgov.org ; Percy.Burch@sfgov.org ; waltonstaff@sfgov.org ; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Engage@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org ; Lorenzo.Rosales@sfgov.org ; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org ; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org ; Madison.Sauer@sfgov.org ; dorseystaff@sfgov.org ; Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org ; Sam.Lauer@sfgov.org ; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org ; Danny.Safai@sfgov.org ; Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org ; SafaiStaff@sfgov.org

**From:**
Judi Gorski, District 4; zip code 94116

**Date:** November 1, 2025

**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

**- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing**
**- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater** (See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
**- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline**

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

**Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.**

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.

The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Judi Gorski
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.

Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.

Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.

Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.

Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

**From:** Patrick Le
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:53:51 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We need to just get this through the Land Use Committee and passed with minimal revisions/amendments as possible. The longer we wait, the longer we are in this affordability crisis that is causing San Francisco to lose thousands of people each year and make it harder for the citizens who live here to survive. Perfection is the enemy of good, and we need to make good progress.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Patrick Le
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:55:40 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. We just need to stop messing around and get this passed with minimal amendments and revisions as possible. The longer we wait, the more people will leave SF. Perfection is the enemy of good and we just need to build more housing of all different stocks asap.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickhle00@gmail.com
411 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Stephen Gorski
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Shah, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chanten (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff
**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 12:52:53 PM

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

**To:**
john.Carroll@sfgov.org , board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org , Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org , Jen.Low@sfgov.org , MelgarStaff@sfgov.org , connie.chan@sfgov.org , Frances.Shah@sfgov.org , ChanStaff@sfgov.org , rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org , mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org , Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org , jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org , jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org , fielderstaff@sfgov.org , shamann.walton@sfgov.org , Percy.Busch@sfgov.org , waltonstaff@sfgov.org , Chanten.Chen@sfgov.org , jackie.fraser@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org , ionatan.Rosas@sfgov.org , SherrillStaff@sfgov.org , matt.dorsey@sfgov.org , Madison.Tam@sfgov.org , dorseystaff@sfgov.org , bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org , ahsa.safai@sfgov.org , MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org , Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org , Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org , SauterStaff@sfgov.org

**From:**
Stephen J. Gorski, District 4, zip code 94116

**Date:** November 1, 2025

**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

**- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing**
**- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater**(See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
**- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline**

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

**Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.**

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.
The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq.
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

- Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.
- Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.
- Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.
- Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.
- Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

Sent from my iPad

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stardust Doherty |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Stardust |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 1:42:02 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Stardust Doherty
SF 94110

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Elliot Helman |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:48:56 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Elliot Helman
Mission Bay SF 94158

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Romano |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: Please vote no on Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan and replace It with a Real Affordable Housing Plan |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 4:05:29 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors, et al:

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you stop seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators. Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing.

Thank you,

David Romano
San Francsico CA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Dave Rhody |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 2, 2025 1:20:00 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis:

- San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

- Instead of Lurie's plan which simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, we need to focus on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so.

You need to stop negotiating mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please replace the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

- Thank you,
Dave Rhody

SF Policy Co-Chair
Climate Reality Project

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carolyn Kenady |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Cc:** | <board@doloresheights.org> |
| **Subject:** | Oppose Mayor"s Upzoning Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 2, 2025 4:05:57 PM |

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

To the members of the Board of Supervisors -

I am Carolyn Kenady, chair of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC) in District 8. We oppose this Upzoning Plan and urge you to amend it to address the issues below.

DHIC opposes this strategy to upzone hundreds of thousands of SF properties because it's:

- Overkill: To meet its housing mandate, San Francisco only needs to approve 36,200 additional projects by 2032. Blanket upzoning allows demolition of existing housing - which is our most affordable housing

- Doesn't produce enough affordable units: 80% of the projects needed to reach this 36K goal must be affordable housing. The affordable requirements and subsidies provided by the proposed program won't produce the required 29k affordable units.

- Not increase market production or reduce housing costs: Per SF Planning's own feasibility study, only slightly improved economic assumptions, will developers undertake market-rate multi-unit projects (1-2 BR, avg $4600 monthly.) The City Economist's impact analysis shows very little impact on rents or prices for housing. (see pages 34 - 63 of SF Planning memo to SF Planning Commissioners, dated June 26, 2025 and the City Economist's Report, page 21, October 2025)

- Displacing tenant and small businesses: in my neighborhood shopping districts - Church & 24th Streets and the Castro NCDs are proposed for 65 foot heights. Most renters and small local businesses displaced by new construction won't be able to afford the new rents. Our small local businesses that attract shoppers and tourists to our neighborhoods will be driven out.

This plan caters to developers. It does not align with our City's housing needs: keeping existing housing – our most affordable resource, preserving the historic and cultural

resources enjoyed by visitors and residents alike, and being more strategic about where to add height vs. blanket zoning large areas of our City. Please revise this plan to protect our key resources, add sufficient affordability, and use height strategically. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Nick Ferris |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 7:22:43 AM |
| **Attachments:** | THD Land Use Transportation Upzoning Plan 11.3.pdf |

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

**1. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are 37,156 people per square mile in North Beach as compared to 17,325 people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only 800 units by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to 5,900 units, a stunning 650% increase. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

**2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing.

We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

**3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

**4. Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

**5. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, *President*
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

November 3, 2025
*Via Email*

Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*

Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*

Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**RE: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN**
**Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073**

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. **Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing. We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. **THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. **Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | aeboken |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #6 [General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan] File #250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 8:13:34 AM |

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #6
[General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan] File #250966

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

To the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, we didn't elect you to play the part of victims.

You tell us to swallow the poison pill and support the upzoning because the only other option is for the State and Builders Remedy to take over our planning process.

Are you unwilling to sue the State or fight back if the State attempts a hostile takeover of our planning process?

If you were willing to call out the proposed hostile takeover by the National Guard, then this should also be on the table.

Don't say you're going to come back next year and review the current proposed upzoning with the possibility of down zoning.

SB330 (Skinner) (2019) expressly prohibits down zoning.

And finally, the Planning Department has acknowledged that the upzoning maps don't include Special Use Districts (SUD).

In District 4, the SUD is defined in BOS File #230808.

It allows the upzoning of corner lots as well as the lot merger of up to three lots on either side of that corner lot.

An example would be the Gus's Market project at 3701 Noriega.

This is the poster child for gentrification in District 4.

The apartments are all market rate.

The amenities include an onsite fitness center and rooftop lounge.

There is onsite parking for the market but not for the apartments.

The Gus's market is high end.

The massive four story building towers over other structures.

It has no step down to transition to lower heights buildings surrounding it.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

**From:** aeboken
**To:** BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
**Subject:** Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #7 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] File #250700
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 8:17:50 AM

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors members

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #7 [Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan] File #250700

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The Planning Department has stated that it has learned from the mistakes it made in the past in redevelopment.

For the proposed upzoning on the Westside, in general, and the Coastal Zone, in particular, the past mistakes of redevelopment seem to be playing out once again.

The Lurie plan focuses upzoning heavily on the Westside including the Coastal Zone.

In two meetings on the Westside, the Mayor has stated that the current amendments should be approved to meet the HCD deadline and can be revisited next year.

The Planning Department staff at one Westside meeting even went so far as to state that down zoning next year would be possible.

This contradicts SB330 (Skinner) (2019) which expressly prohibits down zoning.

The Family Zoning Plan even contradicts itself with family zoning which are larger units and density decontrol which are smaller units.

In proposed ordinance 250700, the following text is potentially problematic:

- Page 7 lines 14 - 22 regarding Local Coastal Program (LCP) rezoning height and bulk to R-4 and RTO-C.

- Page 11 lines 7 - 17 LCP Height Maps HT01 - HT13.

- Page 13 lines 11 - 16. Housing Choice SF (HC-SF)

- Page 15 lines 5 - 7 HC-SF

- Page 17 lines 20 - 22 HC-SF

- Page 20 lines 1 - 4 LCP Zoning Use District Map ZN13 & Height and Bulk District Map HT13.

- Page 21 lines 4 - 5 "All properties in the Coastal Zone are in the new Height and Bulk District R-4".

Are these amendments designed to change Ocean Beach into Miami Beach?

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | aeboken |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #9 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations - Family Zoning Plan] File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 8:22:25 AM |

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #9 [Planning, Business and Tax Regulations - Family Zoning Plan] File #250701

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

SB828 (Wiener) (session 2017 - 2018) has caused the current housing numbers required by the State to more than double for San Francisco.

The Embarcadero Institute analysis states that the housing numbers required by the State (Regional Housing Needs Allocation aka RHNA) for all municipalities skyrocketed in part because of requirements in SB828 (Wiener).

SB828 (Wiener) added in new overcrowding and cost burdening numbers even though these numbers were already in the Department of Finance numbers which the DofF provides to the Department of Housing and Community Development for RHNA.

This results in double counting.

SB828 (Wiener) also used an incorrect vacancy rate as it failed to differentiate between vacancy rates for rental and homeowner housing units.

It uses only the higher rate for rentals when calculating vacancy rates for both rental and homeowner housing unit.

This also results in overcounting.

Even though Scott Wiener is aware of these issues with SB828, he hasn't introduced any "clean-up" bills.

The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) allocated 441,000 housing units for the current RHNA cycle #6 to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

ABAG could have appealed this number to HCD as being too high but chose not to.

ABAG created a methodology to allocate RHNA numbers to the different Bay Area municipalities.

ABAG allocated 82,000 units to San Francisco.

San Francisco could have appealed this number to ABAG as being too high but chose not to.

San Francisco has about 10% of the Bay Area's population but was allocated about 18% of the region's RHNA housing units.

This alone should have been justification for the City to appeal to ABAG.

Since San Francisco is a charter city, why isn't the City suing the state?

Other municipalities in SoCal have successfully sued the State over SB9 (Atkins) (session 2021-2022).

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | aeboken |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11 [Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 8:27:44 AM |

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11
[Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The City could place itself in legal jeopardy by transmitting the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments to the Coastal Commission.

The citation of the California Public Resources Code is incorrect notably California Public Resources Code 30604 (g).

San Francisco has no authority to amend the California Public Resources Code through what appears to be an intentionally incorrect citation.

By default, the California Public Resources Code issue makes the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

The Planning Department hasn't had staff knowledgeable in the Coastal Act since 2018.

Therefore, the revisions to the City's Local Coastal Program have been questionable.

The Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Board of Appeals also lack expertise in the Coastal Act.

As currently drafted, the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments are inconsistent with the General Plan and its 8 priority policies.

All of these issues would result in the Local Coastal Program being bastardized as well as changing Ocean Beach into Miami Beach.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | aeboken |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | Strongly OPPOSING Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11 [Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 8:27:44 AM |

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

TO: Land Use and Transportation Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FR: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting November 3, 2025 Agenda Item #11
[Local Coastal Program - Family Zoning Plan] File #250985

Position: Strongly OPPOSING

The City could place itself in legal jeopardy by transmitting the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments to the Coastal Commission.

The citation of the California Public Resources Code is incorrect notably California Public Resources Code 30604 (g).

San Francisco has no authority to amend the California Public Resources Code through what appears to be an intentionally incorrect citation.

By default, the California Public Resources Code issue makes the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

The Planning Department hasn't had staff knowledgeable in the Coastal Act since 2018.

Therefore, the revisions to the City's Local Coastal Program have been questionable.

The Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Board of Appeals also lack expertise in the Coastal Act.

As currently drafted, the proposed Local Coastal Program amendments are inconsistent with the General Plan and its 8 priority policies.

All of these issues would result in the Local Coastal Program being bastardized as well as changing Ocean Beach into Miami Beach.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Erica Zweig |
| **To:** | Connie Chan; ChanStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 11/3 D4ward Position "Family" Housing plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 10:24:30 AM |
| **Attachments:** | D4ward letter on upzoning.pdf |

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

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android

D4ward is a grassroots network of Sunset District neighbors working to keep our community a place where regular people can afford to live, thrive, and have a real say in what happens here. We support affordable housing, stand up to big-money influence in San Francisco politics, protect workers, defend our coastline, and fight for community needs over corporate interests.

We are deeply concerned that, due to the delay in appointing a new District 4 Supervisor, our district is now being upzoned **without representation** on the current Board of Supervisors. Proceeding with this legislation under these circumstances amounts to **government without representation**. The Board should **postpone all hearings and votes on District 4 zoning changes until a new Supervisor is seated.**

---

## D4ward's Key Positions and Priorities

In general, D4ward supports the **amendments proposed by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen** at the first Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on the Mayor's upzoning plan. We urge the Board to incorporate these changes to protect affordability, safety, and neighborhood integrity.

Our specific priorities are:

**1. Accelerate downtown office-to-housing conversions.**
Before targeting stable, working-class neighborhoods like ours for massive rezoning, the City must aggressively pursue the conversion of empty downtown office buildings into housing.

**2. Protect small businesses and tenants in District 4.**
Under the Mayor's plan, our unique small businesses would become targets for demolition along all commercial corridors. We strongly support the **Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF)** and Supervisor Chan's **Tenant Protection Ordinance** to safeguard both tenants and neighborhood-serving businesses.

**3. Eliminate in-lieu fees.**
Developers must not be allowed to "fee out" of affordable housing requirements. In-lieu fees only produce delayed, off-site projects and create enclaves of market-rate luxury housing.

**4. Dedicate all suitable public land for 100% affordable housing.**
All appropriate public land—excluding parks and open space—should be reserved for **100% affordable housing** serving a full range of incomes, from middle-income working families to deeply affordable and supportive housing.

**5. Preserve the Coastal Zone.**
No land should be removed from the existing Coastal Zone boundaries. Coastal protections are essential for public safety, environmental resilience, and equity.

**6. Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.**
It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation. The City must also repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system.

**7. Ensure fire safety before allowing large-scale development.**
No significant new upzoning should take effect until a secure **emergency firefighting water system** is installed in the Sunset and Parkside Districts, which are already vulnerable to wildfire and earthquake-related fires.

**8. Protect historic and culturally significant buildings.**
All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings and districts** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.

**9. Prevent excessive height near parks and schools.**
Properties bordering the southern edges of our parks and schools should not be upzoned for additional height. Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character the City claims to value.

Erica Zweig
Corresponding Secretary

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | James Lloyd |
| **To:** | Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney |
| **Subject:** | Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:14 AM |
| **Attachments:** | San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf |

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Nov 3, 2025

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**49 South Van Ness Avenue**
**San Francisco, CA 94103**

**Re: Housing Element Implementation**

**By email:** Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

**Cc:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

## State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

### Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. ( See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

## The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

## The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

Nov 3, 2025

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**49 South Van Ness Avenue**
**San Francisco, CA 94103**

**Re: Housing Element Implementation**

**By email:** Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

**Cc:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

## State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

### Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. ( See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

## The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

## The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | James Lloyd |
| **To:** | Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney |
| **Subject:** | Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:15 AM |
| **Attachments:** | San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf |

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

**From:** Robyn Tucker
**To:** MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff
**Cc:** Carroll, John (BOS); SauterStaff; kcourtney@xdm.com
**Subject:** Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 11:59:18 AM

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

Sent via Email

November 2, 2025

From: The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)

To: SF Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association and our 300+ supporters to request preservation of our 40 feet height limits and 45% rear yard setbacks for the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Pacific Avenue History
From 2004 through 2009, PANA leadership worked shoulder to shoulder with a designated member from the San Francisco Planning Department to plan and design our neighborhood to better serve our community then and in the future. The result of our collaboration was legislation establishing the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. The legislation's key elements set building heights at 40 feet, rear yard setbacks at 45% for specific lots to encourage contiguous green open space, and businesses that would best serve and protect our neighborhood.

In addition, in legislation notesthat taller buildings should be at located at corners to minimize impact on the entire surrounding residential blocks and under no circumstance should taller buildings be located mid block. Hence, the design would be one of staggered height, moving east to west.

Decades ago, Pacific Avenue was expected to develop into a Commercial thoroughfare. This never happened. In fact, historically, most of the commercial activity consisted of sweat shops and garages that are no longer present, except some small business garages continue to flourish. Parking has always been at an has always been at a premium as Pacific Ave narrows from east to West with the most narrow portion between Leavenworth and Polk Street.

Family Zoning Plan
The original Family Zoning Plan heights for 12 square blocks that make up the Pacific Avenue NCD, which include from the North and South - Broadway to Jackson Streets and from East and West - Taylor to Polk Street maintained the current 40 foot height. It is unclear whether the rear yard setbacks have been modified or eliminated. We asked that they remain to allow for maximum light and air.

Respectfully, the Pacific Avenue neighborhood Association asks that the Family Zoning Plan be modified to respect our current height limits in an eight block rectangle between Leavenworth and Polk Street along Pacific Avenue and between Broadway and Jackson Street and on our alley's adjacent to and within our Pacific Avenue community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

Robyn Tucker
Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA)
7 McCormick Street (7 ft wide alley)
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-609-5607

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Paul Wermer |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | SherrillStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | File No. 250701 Family Zoning Plan - Ammendment needed to avoid gaming the system |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 11:59:07 AM |

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

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee:

At the last hearing, I spoke to a very specific problem: The upzoning bonuses under Sec 206.10, Housing Choice -San Francisco Program do not require any inclusionary or mixed income housing to serve the needs of San Franciscans. The concern has not been addressed.

The State programs all require significant affordability contributions to qualify. Apparently San Francisco does not, and based on Planning's Residential Nexus studies, the existing language may exacerbate the housing affordability problem we face.

Unfortunately, Sec 206.10 only requires that at least one unit be added, and the project must comprise at least 2 units, excluding ADUs, to qualify for the Local Program Bonus. No inclusionary requirements apply unless at least 10 units are built.

This creates a perverse incentive - especially in desirable areas, where views or amenities are attractive to the wealthier segment of San Francisco, small projects can qualify for the Local Program Bonus. This creates the opportunity for projects of between 2 and 9 units, each up to 4000 sq ft in size, catering to the very wealthy. There are hundreds of attractive sites - with views of the Bay, the ocean, Golden Gate Park, one lot adjacent to the Presidio. In aggregate there are potentially hundreds if not thousands of luxury apartments with desirable views. Furthermore, for RTO-C areas, commercial spaces are allowed - offering additional rentable space where perhaps the view is not so good.

at a minimum, the legislation should require Inclusionary contributions from ALL market rate projects qualifying for the Local Program.

Sincerely,

Paul Wermer

--
Paul Wermer
2309 California St
San Francisco,CA 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | James Lloyd |
| **To:** | Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Cityattorney |
| **Subject:** | Re: public comment re items 6-11 for today"s Land Use Committee meeting |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 11:40:13 AM |
| **Attachments:** | San Francisco - Housing Choice SF Letter - BoS Land Use Committee 2025.11.03.pdf |

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

Please disregard the previous message.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

On Mon, Nov 3, 2025 at 11:35 AM James Lloyd <james@calhdf.org> wrote:

> Dear San Francisco City Council,
>
> The California Housing Defense Fund submits the attached public comment for today's City Council Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting regarding the Family Zoning plan, agendized as items 6 through 11.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> James M. Lloyd
> Director of Planning and Investigations
> California Housing Defense Fund
> james@calhdf.org
> CalHDF is grant & donation funded
> Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

Nov 3, 2025

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**49 South Van Ness Avenue**
**San Francisco, CA 94103**

**Re: Housing Element Implementation**

**By email:** Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, DorseyStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, SherrillStaff@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

**Cc:** john.carroll@sfgov.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org; cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") writes in advance of the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 3, 2025 at 1:30pm. CalHDF writes to warn the Committee, as well as the larger Board, that certain elements of the proposed Housing Choice-San Francisco ("HCSF") plan – which is, in turn, part of the overall Family Zoning Plan – violate state law. The HCSF program, in its current form, would explicitly forbid the application of state housing laws and/or require housing project applicants to waive protections they and their projects are entitled to under state law. The City, however, lacks authority to enact a program with these restrictions.

If the City does not obey the law, CalHDF will challenge the City in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties for failure to comply with housing element law. The City would also be ordered to grant development applicants access to *both* the HCSF program *and* state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law (the "SDBL"). CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with the law in the first instance. The City should drop the HCSF program's effort to carve itself out of the SDBL and other state laws.

//

## State Law Limits Certain Aspects of the Proposed Housing Choice–San Francisco Bonus Program

The proposed HCSF bonus program provides additional residential zoning capacity for projects that meet certain criteria. Overall, this is good. However, one of the HCSF eligibility criteria poses a problem: the requirement, found in section 206.10(b)(5), that an HCSF project "not receive any density or development bonuses or relief from applicable Planning Code standards in any other State or local law or program." This requirement is unenforceable to the extent it pertains to state law, and, should it be enacted, developers will have the option to ignore it.

This is for four reasons. First, the City "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 572, 595.) Second, just as the City cannot waive state law's application, project applicants cannot waive protections to which they are entitled under state law, since those protections are designed to serve the public interest. (See Civ. Code, § 3513 ["a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement"].) Third, the SDBL includes explicit rules for local density bonus programs: such programs must build on, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Finally, even if the first three points are ignored, the SDBL allows project applicants to waive the HCSF eligibility requirement forbidding the use of state bonuses. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).) Legal interpretations from the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD"), the state agency charged with interpreting and enforcing state housing law, support these conclusions.

### Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include AB 2011, codified at Government Code section 65912.100 et seq., the SDBL, codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq., SB 35, codified at Government Code section 65913.4, and more besides. These laws accomplish a variety of pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that meet certain criteria (such as the inclusion of affordable units) to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions. In some cases, whether a project is eligible for state law protections and the extent to which it may reduce or avoid local rules depends on the generosity of the local zoning code. For example, the SDBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed HCSF program expands the San Francisco zoning code's accommodation for denser housing in much of the City. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects, providing for even greater density and even more

forgiving standards for projects. But there is a catch: the HCSF program attempts to forestall these state laws, in section 206.10(b)(5). If not for proposed section 206.10(b)(5), housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under the HCSF rules and avail themselves of the full range of state law protections. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 206.10(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both the HCSF rules and any state law bonuses or protections that apply.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 206.10(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the HCSF program. The City is careful to word the section to dance around the point, perhaps in recognition of the legal consequences, but the section's intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

As explained above, numerous state laws – particularly the SDBL – grant certain housing projects legal protections. None of these state laws allows local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 206.10(b)(5) of the proposed HCSF program, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. ( See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of these laws, as the City's proposed HCSF program would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the HCSF program does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to an HCSF project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the HCSF program and state law.

<u>The State Density Bonus Law Creates Narrow Guidelines for Local Bonus Programs, Which the HCSF Program Does Not Obey</u>

The SDBL does allow local governments to implement local bonus programs. It includes strict rules for such programs, however, which the proposed HCSF program does not meet. Local bonus programs must add to, rather than supplant, the SDBL. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (n), states: "nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a city, county, or city and county from granting a density bonus *greater than* what is described in this section for a development that meets the requirements of this section" (emphasis added). By negative implication, local governments are forbidden from offering density bonuses that do not incorporate, at minimum, the bonuses allowed by the SDBL. Local bonus programs must add to the SDBL; they cannot displace it in favor of an entirely separate density bonus scheme. As described above, moreover, preemption principles prevent local governments from evading the SDBL, and this language in the SDBL confirms that outcome.

The SDBL includes stronger language too. Government Code section 65917 states:

> In enacting this chapter it is the intent of the Legislature that the density bonus or other incentives offered by the city, county, or city and county pursuant to this chapter shall contribute significantly to the economic feasibility of lower income housing in proposed housing developments. **In the absence of an agreement by a developer in accordance with Section 65915, a locality shall not offer a density bonus or any other incentive that would undermine the intent of this chapter.**

(Emphasis added.) In other words, if San Francisco wishes to offer a density bonus to developers, it must first allow them any protections they are entitled to under the SDBL. Only then can it offer a local bonus program. The law establishes a clear baseline: project applicants may avail themselves of any bonuses and benefits they are entitled to under the SDBL, and further local bonuses and benefits must come on top of the SDBL.

These rules are especially important in San Francisco. HCD has found that the SDBL is "critical" for developers navigating San Francisco's complex zoning rules and extensive procedural hurdles. (See "Examining Local Law, Policy, and Planning Practice on Development in San Francisco Using CALES," O'Neill et al., pp. 38-39 (available here).) In some cases, HCD has issued Notices of Violation to San Francisco for impeding housing development by refusing to grant bonuses, incentives, and waivers allowed by the SDBL. (See, e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development, Letter to Kate Conner, December 29, 2022 (available here).) These HCD findings and Notices of Violation confirm the SDBL's importance in producing housing in San Francisco.

The proposed HCSF program, by attempting to displace the SDBL entirely, violates the SDBL's explicit rules for local bonus program. This violation carries particular significance for San Francisco, where project applicants often rely on the SDBL to navigate a complex zoning code and approval process. If San Francisco wishes to implement a local bonus program, it must stack that program on top of the SDBL. It cannot offer an "alternative" bonus program, such as the proposed HCSF program, that attempts to remove SDBL eligibility for projects that are eligible for SDBL protections.

In closing this section, CalHDF notes that HCD has weighed in on the question of whether local governments may enact zoning bonus programs that serve as alternatives to state law. In a letter to Menlo Park (available here), the Department wrote: "[T]he City's Affordable Housing Overlay states that the overlay will be an alternative to state density bonus law. **This is in conflict with state law and must be revised."** (Emphasis added.)[2] HCD's view warrants substantial deference as the interpretation of a "technical, obscure, [or] complex" statutory

[2] Separately, as explained later in this letter, HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook (available here) analyzes whether zoning overlays or other local zoning programs established by a city's housing element may supplant or displace the SDBL and firmly establishes that they cannot. (See pages 14-15 of the guidebook.) This analysis is more relevant to the question of how the HCSF program will affect the City's compliance with the Housing Element Law, but this analysis also underscores the specific point that the City may not wriggle out of state law.

scheme by the agency charged with enforcing it. (See *Boling v. Public Employment Relations Bd.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898, 911 [citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 12]; *Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1113, fn. 13 ["We substantially rely on the Department of Housing and Community Development's interpretation [...] regarding compliance with the housing element law"].)

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the SDBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 206.10(b)(5). The SDBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the HCSF except for section 206.10(b)(5) – because it seeks benefits under the SDBL or another state law – and the application of section 206.10(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the HCSF, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF reminds the City that the SDBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

## The HCSF Program Violates the Housing Element Law

Furthermore, the HCSF violates the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). Rezoning programs enacted pursuant to a housing element, such as the proposed Family Zoning Plan and its component HCSF program, may not exempt themselves from state law's application, as HCD has explained in its Site Inventory Guidebook (available here – see pages 14-15). Pursuing the HCSF program as it is currently designed would violate this rule and risk the City's housing element compliance. This would expose it to a range of penalties, including the "builder's remedy."

## The City Should Take Care to Comply with New Caselaw Concerning Housing Element Rezonings

Lastly, the City should take care to ensure that the rezoning complies with housing element law requiring minimum residential density on low-income sites. The newly published Court of Appeal decision *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* (Oct. 10, 2025, No. B336042) ___ Cal.App.5th ___ makes clear that in order to comply with minimum density requirements, local zoning must require that all new development include a minimum

density of residential use. Zoning "overlays" that allow for 100% non-residential development on a site fail to comply with housing element law. The proposed zoning includes many low-income sites that are given additional residential density on top of base commercial zoning. In order to comply with housing element law, the City should make clear that all new development of these sites must include the minimum density of residential use, and that 100% commercial development is prohibited.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Erica Zweig |
| **To:** | Connie Chan; ChanStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 11/3 D4ward Position "Family" Housing plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 10:24:34 AM |
| **Attachments:** | D4ward letter on upzoning.pdf |

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

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android

D4ward is a grassroots network of Sunset District neighbors working to keep our community a place where regular people can afford to live, thrive, and have a real say in what happens here. We support affordable housing, stand up to big-money influence in San Francisco politics, protect workers, defend our coastline, and fight for community needs over corporate interests.

We are deeply concerned that, due to the delay in appointing a new District 4 Supervisor, our district is now being upzoned **without representation** on the current Board of Supervisors. Proceeding with this legislation under these circumstances amounts to **government without representation**. The Board should **postpone all hearings and votes on District 4 zoning changes until a new Supervisor is seated.**

---

## D4ward's Key Positions and Priorities

In general, D4ward supports the **amendments proposed by Supervisors Connie Chan and Chyanne Chen** at the first Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing on the Mayor's upzoning plan. We urge the Board to incorporate these changes to protect affordability, safety, and neighborhood integrity.

Our specific priorities are:

**1. Accelerate downtown office-to-housing conversions.**
Before targeting stable, working-class neighborhoods like ours for massive rezoning, the City must aggressively pursue the conversion of empty downtown office buildings into housing.

**2. Protect small businesses and tenants in District 4.**
Under the Mayor's plan, our unique small businesses would become targets for demolition along all commercial corridors. We strongly support the **Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF)** and Supervisor Chan's **Tenant Protection Ordinance** to safeguard both tenants and neighborhood-serving businesses.

**3. Eliminate in-lieu fees.**
Developers must not be allowed to "fee out" of affordable housing requirements. In-lieu fees only produce delayed, off-site projects and create enclaves of market-rate luxury housing.

**4. Dedicate all suitable public land for 100% affordable housing.**
All appropriate public land—excluding parks and open space—should be reserved for **100% affordable housing** serving a full range of incomes, from middle-income working families to deeply affordable and supportive housing.

**5. Preserve the Coastal Zone.**
No land should be removed from the existing Coastal Zone boundaries. Coastal protections are essential for public safety, environmental resilience, and equity.

**6. Prohibit upzoning in the Tsunami Zone.**
It is reckless to increase building heights or density in areas at high risk of tsunami inundation. The City must also repair and reactivate the local tsunami warning system.

**7. Ensure fire safety before allowing large-scale development.**
No significant new upzoning should take effect until a secure **emergency firefighting water system** is installed in the Sunset and Parkside Districts, which are already vulnerable to wildfire and earthquake-related fires.

**8. Protect historic and culturally significant buildings.**
All **Category A and A-eligible historic buildings and districts** should be exempted from upzoning. District 4's mid-century homes and civic buildings reflect our community's unique cultural heritage and deserve preservation.

**9. Prevent excessive height near parks and schools.**
Properties bordering the southern edges of our parks and schools should not be upzoned for additional height. Casting shadows on open spaces and classrooms undermines the very "well-resourced" character the City claims to value.

Erica Zweig
Corresponding Secretary

**From:** L.D. Kirshenbaum
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** Please, Land Use Committee: Listen to Us!
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:06:32 AM

---

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

Hello to all members of the Land Use Committee:

I am devastated by the trend in ignoring facts and stonewalling constituents.

*We need affordability, and this ill-defined plan will only make housing problems worse.*

I won't be attending today to say this in person; last time seemed like a disrespectful charade.

Sincerely,

– Daniela Kirshenbaum

**From:** Judy Irving
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
**Cc:** Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
**Subject:** Re: Upzoning and demolitions, etc.
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:51:18 AM

---

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

I cannot attend today, but please address the point I made about demolition in my prior email (copied below). How do you rationalize the candy-coating this issue has received?

History will judge your acquiescence to state laws that will, if implemented, will destroy the fabric, culture, and livability of San Francisco.

> On Oct 19, 2025, at 6:00 PM, Judy Irving <films@pelicanmedia.org> wrote:
>
> One of the rationalizations I've heard over and over at meetings concerning the proposed upzoning is that
>
> "Since there have been very few demolitions in the past few years, there are bound to be few in the future."
>
> But in this case history will not repeat itself, because local zoning controls and other restrictions that have kept demolitions in check will be thrown out the window. De-regulation will *incentivize* demolitions because land values will rise so precipitously:
>
> "Buy that building! Tear it down! Build a highrise! Make a ton of money!" From a developer standpoint, it's irresistible.
>
> Don't be taken in by assurances that existing housing for middle-income San Francisco residents will be immune from developer greed.
>
> This is not a "family" plan — it's actually a "wealthy singles" plan, since 75% of new units will be studios and one-bedrooms. How can anyone believe that building highrise condos for well-off tech workers will somehow benefit families?
>
> You can turn this around by refusing to accept the YIMBY lobbyists' rhetoric. You can be proud of the fact that you stood up for small businesses, working-class tenants, and historic buildings by insisting on adaptive re-use of existing structures and 100% affordable development. The proposed amendments to this plan don't do nearly enough. Don't look back a few years from now and say to yourself, "I helped ruin a world-class city."
>
> Thank you.

**From:** Robyn Tucker
**To:** MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChanStaff (BOS)
**Cc:** Carroll, John (BOS); SauterStaff; kcourtney@xdm.com
**Subject:** Agenda Item 6, 250966 General Plan Amendments Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:45:23 AM

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

Sent via Email

November 2, 2025

From: The Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)

To: SF Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association and our 300+ supporters to request preservation of our 40 feet height limits and 45% rear yard setbacks for the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Pacific Avenue History
From 2004 through 2009, PANA leadership worked shoulder to shoulder with a designated member from the San Francisco Planning Department to plan and design our neighborhood to better serve our community then and in the future. The result of our collaboration was legislation establishing the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. The legislation's key elements set building heights at 40 feet, rear yard setbacks at 45% for specific lots to encourage contiguous green open space, and businesses that would best serve and protect our neighborhood.

In addition, in legislation notesthat taller buildings should be at located at corners to minimize impact on the entire surrounding residential blocks and under no circumstance should taller buildings be located mid block. Hence, the design would be one of staggered height, moving east to west.

Decades ago, Pacific Avenue was expected to develop into a Commercial thoroughfare. This never happened. In fact, historically, most of the commercial activity consisted of sweat shops and garages that are no longer present, except some small business garages continue to flourish. Parking has always been at an has always been at a premium as Pacific Ave narrows from east to West with the most narrow portion between Leavenworth and Polk Street.

Family Zoning Plan

The original Family Zoning Plan heights for 12 square blocks that make up the Pacific Avenue NCD, which include from the North and South - Broadway to Jackson Streets and from East and West - Taylor to Polk Street maintained the current 40 foot height. It is unclear whether the rear yard setbacks have been modified or eliminated. We asked that they remain to allow for maximum light and air.

Respectfully, the Pacific Avenue neighborhood Association asks that the Family Zoning Plan be modified to respect our current height limits in an eight block rectangle between Leavenworth and Polk Street along Pacific Avenue and between Broadway and Jackson Street and on our alley's adjacent to and within our Pacific Avenue community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

Robyn Tucker
Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA)
7 McCormick Street (7 ft wide alley)
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-609-5607

**From:** Nick Ferris
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
**Cc:** Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 7:22:47 AM
**Attachments:** THD Land Use Transportation Upzoning Plan 11.3.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

**1. Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are 37,156 people per square mile in North Beach as compared to 17,325 people per square mile in San Francisco. The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only 800 units by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to 5,900 units, a stunning 650% increase. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

**2. Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing.

We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

**3. THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude all rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

**4. Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

**5. Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,
Nick Ferris, *President*
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

November 3, 2025
*Via Email*

Myrna Melgar, Chair - *Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org*

Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair - *Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org*

Bilal Mahmood, Member - *Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org*
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**RE: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FAMILY ZONING PLAN**
**Amendments in File Nos. 251071, 251072, and 251073**

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) continues to oppose the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Upzoning Plan"). As set forth below, we urge the Committee and Board of Supervisors to reverse the last-minute inclusion of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront in the Upzoning Plan. Further, we implore you to amend the Upzoning Plan to prevent the displacement of tenants and small businesses, and to provide for a real plan for development of the affordable housing we so desperately need by approving amendments related legisnation offered by Supervisors Chan and Chen.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront from the Upzoning Plan.**

THD continues to strongly oppose the late inclusion in the Upzoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront, areas that were not included in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("2022 Housing Element") nor considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). These areas were not considered for inclusion in the Housing Element because they are one of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents currently living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings housing our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own data shows that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately 32,340 individual units, 13,983 of which are located in the current version of the Upzoning Plan. **In other words, the tenants occupying 13,983 units will be subject to potential eviction and displacement.**

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

And, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units* by 2050, the Upzoning Plan suddenly increased that figure to *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The height and density increases represented by this increase will significantly impact existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3.

2. **Support for Supervisors Chan's and Chen's Proposed Amendments:**

Although we continue to oppose the Upzoning Plan, we appreciate Supervisor Chan and Chen's leadership in introducing critical amendments to strengthen tenant protections, prioritize affordable housing, support small businesses, and create real family-sized housing. We urge this Committee to move these amendments forward, including those that follow:

(a) Exclude all historic resources, including local historic districts and those eligible for the California and National Registers. from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251073).

(b) Exclude from the Upzoning Plan all development that would demolish, remove, or convert to another use any existing dwelling unit(s) or residential flat, including rent-controlled units.

(c) Remove areas within the Planning Equity Geography Special Use District ("PEG SUD") from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element (File No. 251071)

(d) Remove areas in the Coastal Zone from the Upzoning Plan (File No. 251071)

(e) Adopt a Progress Requirement or "shot clock" for obtaining a building permit within a time certain of project approval (File No. 251073)

(f) Require inclusionary housing to be located nearby within ½ mile of the development (File No. 251073).

(g) Eliminate form-based density from Neighborhood Commercial Districts and ROTCs because we want family housing not dorm rooms (File No. 251073).

3. **THD Urges Supervisor Melgar to Protect All Rent-Controlled Housing**

We appreciate Supervisor Melgar's amendment removing rent controlled housing with three or more units but urge her to expand this amendment to exclude ***all*** rent-controlled housing with two or more units, not just three or more.

4. **Support for Supervisor Chan's Legacy Business Controls**

THD joins with Small Business Forward to support Supervisor Chan's legislation to extend the requirement for a Conditional Use Authorization for sites where a Legacy Business has been displaced. In absence of having any other tools available or financial resources to support the successful relocation of a Legacy Business within the community, the Conditional Use is an imperfect but necessary mechanism to discourage displacement of Legacy Businesses in the first place. That is why Small Business Forward supports that the extension of the CU legislation until other more effective protection measures are in place, such as commercial rent control, the right of return, and adequate relocation assistance.

5. **Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District and Funding Strategy.**

We join with REP-SF and the Council of Community Housing Organizations to demand that the SFMTA-SUD be revised to provide that these publicly owned parcels be developed for 100% affordable and social housing. Under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, as mandated by the state, 57% of the 36,200 new housing units proposed to be developed under the Upzoning Plan—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. Yet the Upzoning Plan has no funding strategy or realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most.

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, THD believes that the Upzoning Plan, as proposed, threatens tenants and small businesses, pits neighborhoods against each other, and disregards decades of community-based policymaking that has built San Francisco into a resilient, vibrant city through a network of strong neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments from Supervisors Chan and Chen address these concerns by focusing on protecting tenants and rent-controlled housing citywide, supporting small businesses, and prioritizing the development of affordable housing. We urge this Committee to move these critical elements forward.

Finally, we urge this Committee to recommend that Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront be removed from the Upzoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors and approved by HCD.

Sincerely,

Nick Ferris, President

ccs: Supervisor Connie Chan – *connie.chan@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors - *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jean Barish |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | LUTC Meeting - Nov. 3, 2025 - Agenda Items 6 - 11 |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 4:07:31 AM |
| **Attachments:** | LUTC Letter 25_11_03.docx |

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

Dear LUTC Committee Members:

Attached above and pasted below is a letter regarding Agenda Items 6 - 11 on the Monday November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting.


***JEAN B BARISH***
***711 27th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121***
***jeanbbarish@hotmail.com***


November 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: November 3, 2025 LUTC Meeting – Agenda Items 6 - 11

Dear Committee Members;

I am the President of Planning Association for the Richmond (sfpar.org) and the Vice-President of SaveMUNI (savemuni.org), two organizations that are very concerned about the impacts of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan. I am writing on my own behalf urging you not to pass this plan as currently written.

Below are just a few of the many reasons why you should not approve this plan as currently written.

- The State's RHNA Numbers are Flawed and the Amount of New Housing Mandated by the State is Overstated
- The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing
- The Plan Will Destroy Many Small Businesses
- Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Must be Eliminated from the Plan
- Upzoning will Significantly Impact the Quality of Life and the Environment in the Richmond and Many Other Neighborhoods
- There are No Provisions in the Plan for Adding Vital Infrastructure
- The Plan Changes the Coastal Zone and Will Irreparably Damage our Priceless Coastal Environment
- There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

This plan has no substantial affordable housing mandates, and will destroy neighborhoods to enable more gentrifying luxury housing. This will further increase skyrocketing rents, evictions and homelessness. There is a gentrification crisis that is destroying San Francisco, and this plan will simply advance that plan while destroying so much that is precious in San Francisco.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Mayor Lurie's plan simply rearranges zoning rules, which does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Further, a serious problem with this plan is that it removes necessary hard-won Coastal protections that are very important to the safety and wellbeing of many San Franciscans, especially those of us living on the west side of the City. Any changes to the existing Coastal zone regulations should be entirely removed from this plan.

Additionally, the City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing. Now that the City Economist has shown that Mayor Lurie's plan won't work you must replace his plan with one that will actually work. San Francisco needs a plan that would identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing; protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review; and produce as much housing as possible out of existing vacancies and empty office space.

Supervisors Chan and Chen have proposed amendments that reduce the harm caused by this plan. While these amendments do not solve the fundamental flaws in this plan, they are a step in the right direction and should be considered.

And we mustn't lose sight of the fact that one of the attractions of San Francisco is its magnificent beauty and spectacular views. Recently, for example, an ad from SF Travel aired on the television broadcast of Game 7 of the World Series. (https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jlZggQV1Fg___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkNzFiZDJjMjZjNTY2MmU4Y2E1ZjNhZTdjZTdlNzU1ZDo3OmQ5Yjl6NDBiNjk5OGQyNmQyODE2ZDc4YjU0NzYzNjM5YjFlZDQ5YzdmOTUxOTIzOTc2YjA0Mjg0OTU4ODM5N2NkMWMzYTp0OkY6Tg) This ad should remind you of how uniquely situated and built San Francisco is. Please do not desecrate our City with an upzoning plan that will turn San Francisco into a concrete, dehumanized megalopolis.

In closing, I urge you to delete and replace the current Family Zoning Plan with one that will actually solve our housing shortage, comply with the State's mandate, satisfy the needs and demands of countless San Franciscans and preserve and protect the splendor of Baghdad by the Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisors C. Chan, S. Sherrill, D. Sauter, M. Dorsey, R. Mandelman, J. Fielder, S. Walton

***JEAN B BARISH***
***711 27th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121***
***jeanbbarish@hotmail.com***

November 3, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: November 3, 2025 LUTC Meeting – Agenda Items 6 - 11

Dear Committee Members;

I am the President of Planning Association for the Richmond (sfpar.org) and the Vice-President of SaveMUNI (savemuni.org), two organizations that are very concerned about the impacts of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan. I am writing on my own behalf urging you not to pass this plan as currently written.

Below are just a few of the many reasons why you should not approve this plan as currently written.

- The State's RHNA Numbers are Flawed and the Amount of New Housing Mandated by the State is Overstated
- The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing
- The Plan Will Destroy Many Small Businesses
- Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Must be Eliminated from the Plan
- Upzoning will Significantly Impact the Quality of Life and the Environment in the Richmond and Many Other Neighborhoods
- There are No Provisions in the Plan for Adding Vital Infrastructure
- The Plan Changes the Coastal Zone and Will Irreparably Damage our Priceless Coastal Environment
- There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

This plan has no substantial affordable housing mandates, and will destroy neighborhoods to enable more gentrifying luxury housing. This will further increase skyrocketing rents, evictions and homelessness. There is a gentrification crisis that is destroying San Francisco, and this plan will simply advance that plan while destroying so much that is precious in San Francisco.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Mayor Lurie's plan simply rearranges zoning rules, which does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Further, a serious problem with this plan is that it removes necessary hard-won Coastal protections that are very important to the safety and wellbeing of many San Franciscans, especially those of us living on the west side of the City. Any changes to the existing Coastal zone regulations should be entirely removed from this plan.

Additionally, the City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing. Now that the City Economist has shown that Mayor Lurie's plan won't work you must replace his plan with one that will actually work. San Francisco needs a plan that would identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing; protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review; and produce as much housing as possible out of existing vacancies and empty office space.

Supervisors Chan and Chen have proposed amendments that reduce the harm caused by this plan. While these amendments do not solve the fundamental flaws in this plan, they are a step in the right direction and should be considered.

And we mustn't lose sight of the fact that one of the attractions of San Francisco is its magnificent beauty and spectacular views. Recently, for example, an ad from SF Travel aired on the television broadcast of Game 7 of the World Series. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jIZggOV1Fg) This ad should remind you of how uniquely situated and built San Francisco is. Please do not desecrate our City with an upzoning plan that will turn San Francisco into a concrete, dehumanized megalopolis.

In closing, I urge you to delete and replace the current Family Zoning Plan with one that will actually solve our housing shortage, comply with the State's mandate, satisfy the needs and demands of countless San Franciscans and preserve and protect the splendor of Baghdad by the Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisors C. Chan, S. Sherrill, D. Sauter, M. Dorsey, R. Mandelman, J. Fielder, S. Walton

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | "George Wooding"; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee |
| **Date:** | Monday, November 3, 2025 10:28:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | chan amendments.docx<br>image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250700

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251071

  Board of Supervisors File No. 250701

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251072

- Board of Supervisors File No. 251073

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

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

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

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other*

*public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Sunday, November 2, 2025 11:28 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
**Subject:** 250966, 250700, 250701 written testimony for November 3, 2025 Land Use and Transportation Committee

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

Hi John,

Please consider me a  person with special needs.  I am requesting early speaking for speaker comments.

My written comments are attached for your review

Land Use and Transportation committee members. Melgar

November 2, 2025

Supervisor  Connie Chans amendments are vital for the mayor's family plan to succeed.

What happened to the "affordable housing" mandates?  They have disappeared.

Here is what the Planning Department's new report, "Rezoning Capacity Calculations," doesn't say: under San Francisco's state-approved Housing Element, **57% of those new homes—more than 20,000 units—must be affordable** to low- and very-low-income households. That's not a suggestion; it's part of the state mandate.

The Family Zoning Plan has no funding strategy, no framework for public land, and no realistic plan to produce those affordable homes. It risks satisfying Sacramento's procedural checklist while abandoning the substance of the law: to build housing for the people who need it most. The city is relying completely on developers, grants, GOBs and subsidized funding from the MOHCD.

-developers are not building due to high land costs and the scarcity of buildable land, high interest rates and high construction costs

-There are almost no grants.  Despite best efforts, The Mayors Office Of Housing and Community Development  (MOHCD) is currently underfunded and has little ability to subsidize low-income housing in San Francisco.

-The CPC is currently not trying to attain more housing funding:  **Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond (Prop A)**: **Approval:** On March 5, 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a $300 million bond to finance the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing.  The funding is on its first tranche--$147.2M

**2019 Affordable Housing GOB ($600 million).**  Approximately $175.9 million remains outstanding, with a final issuance under consideration for late 2025.  $55M is being held for the Mercy Housing build beside Laguna Honda Hospital for a senior center.

**The balance between supply and demand**

San Francisco Politicians and planners don't understand economics. They believe that if they build more units, the price of housing will decrease. This is not true in San Francisco due to market conditions.

Building more houses may not lower prices if there is a simultaneous increase in demand, or if sellers are unwilling to sell for less, a phenomenon known as " downside stickiness". Other factors like high mortgage rates, rising construction costs, and localized market dynamics can also offset the downward pressure on prices that new supply would typically create.

In a basic economic model, increased supply would lead to lower prices if demand remains constant. However, a parallel increase in demand can keep prices stable or even cause them to rise, despite the new houses.

**Rising demand**: Population growth, wage increases, favorable demographic trends, or an influx of institutional investors can drive up demand, absorbing new inventory as it enters the market.

**Pent-up demand**: In areas that have historically restricted development, a sudden increase in construction can be absorbed by years of pent-up demand, causing prices to plateau rather than fall.

The main cause of higher house prices in SF is the cost of land. Buildable Land is becoming so scarce that only Subsidized affordable housing will be built. The cost of affordable housing will continue to rise

Substitutions and proposed amendments On September 30, a new version of number 250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. The report analysis reflects those changes

On October 21, supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the local program on any parcel containing more than two existing housing units which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control

Also, on October 21, supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space As the language of these two amendments was made public last week this report does not attempt to model there economic impact.

**AMENDMENT LANGUAGE**

-Furthering demolition controls to protect tenants.  Absolutely.  Please don't forget to protect the landlords.

-Implementing Nexus studies and impact fees to ensure adequate infrastructure investment, especially given the fact the city is facing existing funding challenges to build out the emergency water firefighting system for well -resourced neighborhoods, a deficit in public transit, an increased risk of tenant and small business displacement;

The West side EWSS  project is already corrupted. The City no longer wants to build Kaboda piping for high water pressure. The fire department is now building large cisterns filled with water and they are also purchasing pump trucks that will connect to other pump tracks. This will allow the fire department to purchase more fire trucks. The cisterns will be attached to the pump trucks which have a limited range. The Kubota piping would have been a much better delivery system but the fire department wanted the trucks. The West side of San Francisco is more in danger of burning than ever before.

The requested reports would be a great idea

-The Mayor's Family Plan does not require developers to build or fix infrastructure.  The City will  bear the full cost of repairs.  This is wrong.  The developer should bare the costs of their own project.

-Placing a shot clock to require developers to build within 30 months to boost housing production in the near future to meet the state mandated timeline of 2031;  The Planning Department already has 70,000 stored at planning

**Factors that influence review time**

- **Project complexity:** The scope and size of a project are major factors in the review timeline. Simple projects may be approved more quickly "over the counter," while complex projects may involve multiple reviews and public hearings.

- **Other reviewing agencies:** Building permits must be reviewed by multiple city departments for safety and code compliance. A permit can be sent back to Planning for another review if changes are made to the plans.

- **Permit type:** The type of permit being applied for, such as a building permit, coastal zone permit, or variance, all have different review processes and timeframes.
- **Application completeness:** Incomplete applications can significantly delay the review process. An application can go through multiple rounds of resubmissions before being accepted for review

LIMITING FORM BASED DENSITY:

Density decontrol is central to the Mayors' family zoning plan. This is the worst type of density planning. A developer can now add as many residential units as they want too. An eight story building can Have thirty units or only one unit. Density decontrol was added to the Mayor's family zoning plan so that San Francisco would have more units then SB 79. This will be uncontrolled density. The city will not stop this program as San Francisco planning is desperate not to be controlled by the state of California

"

Density decontrol" was a core component of the initial **Family Zoning Plan** legislation introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie at the Board of Supervisors on **June 24, 2025**.
The concept of density decontrol, which removes unit limits while maintaining existing height and form restrictions, was part of the plan from its formal introduction as legislation, and was also included in earlier draft proposals developed by the Planning Department under former Mayor London Breed. The legislation is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

"

Form-based density" is not an inherently negative planning concept; rather, **specific implementations of form-based codes (FBCs) may face criticisms related to how density is managed, or some residents may object to the very idea of increased density** which FBCs often facilitate.
Common criticisms or perceived negative aspects related to form-based codes and density include:

- **Community Opposition to Increased Density:** A primary objection from some local residents is that FBCs "promote density and population increases to the detriment of locals" or conflict with an existing "small-town feel". The perception of form-based codes mandating high density can lead to community pushback during the adoption process.

- **Potential for Gentrification:** By creating highly desirable, walkable communities, FBCs can inadvertently result in new developments that sell or rent at a premium, potentially pricing out lower-income residents if affordable housing provisions are not included in the code.

- **Complexity and Administration Challenges:** Form-based codes can be more complex to write and administer than conventional Euclidean zoning, requiring specialized training for planners and staff to interpret design standards objectively. This complexity can lead to confusion, increased review times, or a greater need for variances if the code is not carefully written.

- **"Locking in" Undesirable Existing Forms:** If a form-based code is based strictly on the current urban fabric of an area, it might inadvertently "lock in" low-density, car-dependent patterns, making it harder to densify those areas later if needed to address housing shortages or promote sustainability.

- **Ignoring Market Realities:** Critics sometimes argue that FBCs are overly prescriptive or ignore market demands, although proponents argue that market studies are often a key component of a well-crafted FBC. In some cases, a local market may not be able to support the specific mixed-use or retail components called for in the code.

- **Loss of Perceived "Local Control":** FBCs often streamline the approval process by making projects that meet the code "by-right" (administrative review without public hearings), which some residents or community groups may see as a reduction in public participation and control over individual projects

There should be an amendment for form based density, but San Francisco well never pass this amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

George Wooding

415 695-1393

**From:** T Flandrich
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
**Cc:** Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChenStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS)
**Subject:** FAMILY ZONING PLAN AMENDMENTS: SUPPORT CHAN, CHEN AMENDMENTS
**Date:** Sunday, November 2, 2025 11:49:20 AM

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

1 November 2025
Dear Chair Melgar, Supervisors Chen & Mahmood,
I am writing to ask you to support the amendments made by Supervisor Chan. Most importantly, the amendment which will preserve ALL rent-controlled housing thereby continuing to have real affordable housing choices for tenants today & in the future.

While I appreciate Supervisor Melgar's attempt to carve out some rent-controlled buildings, that amendment unfortunately does not go far enough.

I also ask you to support Supervisor Chen's amendments, especially as they address affordability, to serve our needs, our goal of creating, building 100% affordable housing. Public land must be used for public good.

In 2023, our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. Protecting tenants, our existing homes and using all available public land to build 100% affordable housing, must be our achievement.

Thank you for your consideration.
Theresa Flandrich
North Beach Tenants Committee

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Dave Rhody |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 2, 2025 1:20:00 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis:

- San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates.

- Instead of Lurie's plan which simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, we need to focus on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so.

You need to stop negotiating mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please replace the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

- Thank you,
Dave Rhody

SF Policy Co-Chair
Climate Reality Project

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carolyn Kenady |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Cc:** | <board@doloresheights.org> |
| **Subject:** | Oppose Mayor"s Upzoning Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, November 2, 2025 4:05:58 PM |

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

To the members of the Board of Supervisors -

I am Carolyn Kenady, chair of the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC) in District 8. We oppose this Upzoning Plan and urge you to amend it to address the issues below.

DHIC opposes this strategy to upzone hundreds of thousands of SF properties because it's:

- Overkill: To meet its housing mandate, San Francisco only needs to approve 36,200 additional projects by 2032. Blanket upzoning allows demolition of existing housing - which is our most affordable housing

- Doesn't produce enough affordable units: 80% of the projects needed to reach this 36K goal must be affordable housing. The affordable requirements and subsidies provided by the proposed program won't produce the required 29k affordable units.

- Not increase market production or reduce housing costs: Per SF Planning's own feasibility study, only slightly improved economic assumptions, will developers undertake market-rate multi-unit projects (1-2 BR, avg $4600 monthly.) The City Economist's impact analysis shows very little impact on rents or prices for housing. (see pages 34 - 63 of SF Planning memo to SF Planning Commissioners, dated June 26, 2025 and the City Economist's Report, page 21, October 2025)

- Displacing tenant and small businesses: in my neighborhood shopping districts - Church & 24th Streets and the Castro NCDs are proposed for 65 foot heights. Most renters and small local businesses displaced by new construction won't be able to afford the new rents. Our small local businesses that attract shoppers and tourists to our neighborhoods will be driven out.

This plan caters to developers. It does not align with our City's housing needs: keeping existing housing – our most affordable resource, preserving the historic and cultural

resources enjoyed by visitors and residents alike, and being more strategic about where to add height vs. blanket zoning large areas of our City. Please revise this plan to protect our key resources, add sufficient affordability, and use height strategically. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stardust Doherty |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Stardust |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 1:42:02 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Stardust Doherty
SF 94110

**From:** Stephen Gorski
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walsh, Frances (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chanson (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorraine (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Lee, Mandelman (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Walkswood, Ahsha (BOS); Lopez, Gracelyn (BOS); WalkswoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff
**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 12:52:46 PM

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

**To:**
John.Carroll@sfgov.org , board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org , Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org , Jen.Low@sfgov.org , MelgarStaff@sfgov.org , connie.chan@sfgov.org , Frances.Walsh@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org , mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org , Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org , jackie.fielder@sfgov.org , jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org , fielderstaff@sfgov.org , shamann.walton@sfgov.org , Percy.Burch@sfgov.org , waltonstaff@sfgov.org , "Jeanne Chen@sfgov.org , jackie.prager@sfgov.org , ChenStaff@sfgov.org , Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org , lorraine.Rosas@sfgov.org , SherrillStaff@sfgov.org , matt.dorsey@sfgov.org , Madison.Lee@sfgov.org , dorseystaff@sfgov.org , Ahsha.Walkswood@sfgov.org , gracelyn.lopez@sfgov.org , MalkswoodStaff@sfgov.org , Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org , Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org , SauterStaff@sfgov.org

**From:**
Stephen J. Gorski, District 4, zip code 94116

**Date:** November 1, 2025

**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

**- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing**
**- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater**(See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
**- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline**

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

**Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.**

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.
The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq.
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

- Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.
- Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.
- Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.
- Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.
- Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

Sent from my iPad

**From:** Judi Gorski
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chen, Connie (BOS); Wong, Frances (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Fariñas, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Busch, Percy (BOS); WaltonStaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Engage, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosales, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sauer, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lauer, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Safai, Danny (BOS); SafaiStaff; Andrews, Michelle (BOS); AndrewsStaff
**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm
**Date:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01:00 AM

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

**To:**
John.Carroll@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org ; Jen.Low@sfgov.org ; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org ; connie.chen@sfgov.org ; Frances.Wong@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org ; mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org ; Calvin.Ho@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org ; Jennifer.Farinas@sfgov.org ; FielderStaff@sfgov.org ; shamann.walton@sfgov.org ; Percy.Burch@sfgov.org ; waltonstaff@sfgov.org ; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org ; Jackie.Engage@sfgov.org ; ChenStaff@sfgov.org ; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org ; Lorenzo.Rosales@sfgov.org ; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org ; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org ; Madison.Sauer@sfgov.org ; dorseystaff@sfgov.org ; Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org ; Sam.Lauer@sfgov.org ; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org ; Danny.Safai@sfgov.org ; Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org ; SafaiStaff@sfgov.org

**From:**
Judi Gorski, District 4; zip code 94116

**Date:** November 1, 2025

**Subject:** Public Comment: VOTE NO on Mayor Lurie's Family Housing Plan and Replace it with a Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 - Land Use and Transportation Meeting, Monday, Nov. 3, 2025, 1:30 pm

Dear Supervisors,

As a District 4 San Franciscan without representation on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's Family Upzoning Plan as it currently exists. As it is now written, the Plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I speak for myself, my family, and many of my neighbors to respectfully ask you to:

**- Require adequate infrastructure to be built PRIOR to building any additional housing**
**- Refuse to allow the use of *geo grouting to harden the earth and sand beneath proposed new housing building sites as it poisons our groundwater** (See geo-grouting info at end of this email.)
**- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline**

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

As currently written, this Plan clears the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices and the safety of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

**Our far western District 4 does not have existing infrastructure to support these new high-rises, and infrastructure needs to be designed, funded and built first. Circumventing CEQA requirements in a rush to build jeopardizes our safety.**

We still have three months to replace the Mayor's Plan with one that will work.

The City Economist recently released a report that shows the Mayor's Plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because **zoning changes do not produce new housing**. Therefore, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the Family Zoning Plan and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood and diesel construction equipment, releasing more greenhouse gas emissions.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. Instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan just moves the zoning rules around and does little to increase affordable housing. It increases instead the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply (now at 150%) while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.

Let us not build more excess housing for the wealthy that will create more homelessness and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to corporate real estate speculators.

Please RELACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco homeowners, tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.

Thank you,

Judi Gorski
SF District Resident 47 years , 94116

*CEQA requires that any project involving geo-grouting that requires a discretionary approval by a public agency undergo an environmental review process to identify and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

How geo-grouting can contaminate groundwater:

Toxic additives: Many chemical and cement-based grouts contain additives that can be toxic or carcinogenic and may leach into the surrounding groundwater.

Drilling and installation: The process of drilling holes for grouting can create pathways for surface contaminants to travel directly into aquifers, especially if the boreholes are not sealed properly.

Contaminant pathways: Grouting operations can create or worsen fractures in the ground, creating direct routes for contaminants to flow into groundwater sources.

Chemical reactions: The chemical reactions that occur during the hydration of cement-based grouts can alter the chemistry of the groundwater, potentially increasing dissolved solids and changing its overall characteristics.

Improper disposal: Improper disposal of grout waste can also lead to secondary contamination of soil and water.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lgpetty |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Re: The FZP - Stop Fighting Each Other Over Capacity. Fight the RHNA"s Illegality Instead. Adopt the Humane, Protective Chan, Chen, and Melgar Amendments |
| **Date:** | Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:04:07 AM |

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

Dear Land Use Committee Members and all other Supervisors,

I urged in an October 17 email letter that the Board write its own zoning plan to include strong anti-displacement protections for tenants and small businesses, with a prioritized affordable housing funding & site plan.

Thank you, Supervisors Chan, Chen and Melgar, for attempting to inject decency into the FZP.

Thank you Supervisors Chan and Chen for recognizing that the concepts of compliance and capacity can only be met through a clear-eyed lens of San Francisco's actual needs. Not through the distorted view of those who would profit from unlimited removal and replacement of people and their homes with wealthy people and impossibly costly generic "units."

Capacity and compliance are currently based on a numerical fiction... the made-up structure of "State-Mandated RHNA numbers."

We must stop fighting each other in a futile race to rack up housing unit numbers we were never meant to achieve. RHNA's were designed to be impossibly high -- setting up the City to fail -- so that the State would have a rationale to remove all locally-determined regulations via a State-imposed "builders' remedy."

The RHNA's, even if created with good intentions, have been proven irrelevant by Covid impacts, tariff and construction cost inflation, and the loss of an investor-driven economy.

Let's stop chasing this non-existent RHNA capacity holy grail. Let's turn our efforts instead toward establishing the illegality of the RHNA numbers in court.

Let's stop being afraid.

Refine and strengthen tenant and small business protection Amendments for a revised FZP in the meantime. Create a better, uniquely San Francisco zoning plan that provides mostly affordable housing and does it without destroying ourselves and our City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 senior, renter & voter
Affordable Housing Advocate

Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Magick Altman |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Family Housing |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 8:28:24 PM |

---

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

To whom in may concern, you can usually tell when something is against the people's interest when its called "Family planning". This is a scam to get quick approval of the destruction of our neighborhoods, affordable housing and protections for small businesses. North Beach is fine. LEAVE IT ALONE. There is purpose to the so=called red tape. To make sure the people win and not the developers, who could care less about our neighborhoods.
Stop this illegal and immoral action.
Be Leery of Lurie, Money doesn't talk it Swears.
Yours in Truth,
Magick Altman

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Francesca Pastine |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | SF Supervisors Support Mayor Lurie"s Affordable Housing and SF Neighborhoods Plan |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 7:35:08 PM |

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

Hello All,

As you may know, Mayor Lurie's *Family Housing Plan* will go before the Land Use & Transportation Committee this Monday, November 3, sometime after 2 p.m. I fully support this plan. It's time for San Francisco to take real steps toward building enough housing—especially in the low-density neighborhoods on the west side of the city.

While the City Economist, Ted Egan, recently noted that the plan alone will not meet the city's full housing mandates, it represents an essential step toward building the infrastructure we need for future growth.

Let's create a San Francisco where working-class families and future generations can afford to live and thrive.

Best,

Francesca Pastine

1183 Shotwell Street

415 596 5543

--
https://www.francescapastine.com/
www.pastineprojects.com
IN THE MAKE
http://francescapastine.blogspot.com
http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Eric Brooks |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ho, Calvin (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Prager, Jackie (BOS); ChenStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); SherrillStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); SauterStaff |
| **Subject:** | Public Comment: VOTE NO On Lurie"s Recipe For Housing Failure & Replace It With A Real Affordable Housing Plan - File #250701 |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 31, 2025 6:18:38 PM |

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

Dear Supervisors,

The City Economist just released a report showing that Mayor Lurie's 'Family Zoning' plan will not work and will trigger the State to hijack San Francisco's housing decisions. This is because zoning changes don't produce new affordable housing.

We still have 3 months to replace the Mayor's plan with one that will work. Here's a real strategy to solve the affordable housing crisis.

San Francisco has 70,000 housing units already approved, at least 40,000 vacant housing units, and vast vacant office space that can be converted to thousands of affordable housing units - together more than enough to fulfill state mandates. (Yet instead of focusing on making those units available at affordable rents, and showing the State a solid plan to do so, Lurie's plan simply moves zoning rules around like deck chairs on the Titanic, does almost nothing to increase affordable housing, and increases the already bloated, gentrifying, luxury housing over-supply [now at 150%] while destroying San Francisco neighborhoods.)

Now that the City Economist has shown that Lurie's plan won't work, it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate mere amendments to the 'Family Zoning' Ordinance and replace it with text that will:

1) Identify how to manage existing housing approvals, vacancies, and empty office space to rapidly produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $100,000 per year in a way that will fully meet state mandates.

2) Fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing and review, and strike Lurie's language that unacceptably skips public hearings to put almost all housing decisions in the hands of Planning Department staff.

3) Favor producing housing out of existing vacancies and empty office space as much as possible, instead of building new units. New construction uses massive amounts of cement, wood, and diesel construction equipment, releasing major greenhouse gas emissions.

The Mayor's plan would build more excess housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and

corporate real estate speculators. **Please REPLACE the text in this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco tenants, and environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity, with text that will truly produce affordable housing and get State bureaucrats off of San Francisco's back.**

Thank you,

Eric Brooks, Campaign Coordinator
Our City SF and San Francisco CEQA Defenders
415-756-8844

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:00:33 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 74 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

Sincerely,

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Nick Eckenwiler |
| **To:** | Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) |
| **Cc:** | McDougall, Paul@HCD; gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; Coy, Melinda@HCD; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov; Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov; David Pai |
| **Subject:** | CalHDF Letter Regarding San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:21:46 PM |
| **Attachments:** | San Francisco - Housing Element Rezoning Letter - 2025.10.29 (Report Attached).pdf |

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

Good afternoon,

Please see attached for a letter from the California Housing Defense Fund regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan and the City's obligations under the Housing Element Law.

Sincerely,

--

**Nicholas Eckenwiler**
Staff Attorney

Oct 29, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

**Re: San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation**

**By email:** rachael.tanner@sfgov.org, Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, aly.bonde@sfgov.org, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org

**Cc:** Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov, gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov, Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov, Melinda.Coy@hcd.ca.gov, shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov, David.Zisser@hcd.ca.gov, Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov, Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov, alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov, Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov, David.Pai@doj.ca.gov

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits this letter to outline the City of San Francisco's legal obligations surrounding its efforts to implement its housing element. Specifically, CalHDF writes to remind the City:

1. The City must rezone as promised in its housing element – it must upzone enough to produce (not merely attain capacity for) 36,282 units based on an analytical model that assesses the probability of development for rezoned parcels under current economic conditions.
2. The City's housing element and the housing element law oblige it to reduce constraints on housing production and refrain from adding new constraints, especially in the City's efforts to satisfy its other housing element obligations.

**If the City does not obey the law on these points, CalHDF stands ready to challenge the City's intransigence in court.** Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties, including the payment of CalHDF's attorney's fees. CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with state law, the contours of which are explained in detail below.

## The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning (available at the link and appended to this letter). This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall

reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model such as the City Economists' shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

## The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law. While some of these constraints may be good policy, they pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director

James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

# Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

# Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.

# Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

# Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or “Local Program”, gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

# Details of the Rezoning




The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

# The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

# Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

# Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

# Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

# Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.

# Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

# Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

# San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

# Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

# High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

# Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios




Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

# Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

| Planning District | Historic, 2000-24 | Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 | High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Buena Vista | 975 | 43 | 90 |
| Central | 72 | 192 | 390 |
| Downtown | 289 | 112 | 230 |
| Ingleside | 0 | 58 | 120 |
| Inner Sunset | 123 | 28 | 59 |
| Marina | 131 | 126 | 263 |
| Mission | 187 | 197 | 406 |
| Northeast | 449 | 136 | 283 |
| Outer Sunset | 15 | 16 | 33 |
| Richmond | 0 | 23 | 47 |
| South Central | 0 | 6 | 11 |
| Western Addition | 997 | 658 | 1,265 |
| Total | 3,238 | 1,594 | 3,199 |

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

# Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

| **Low Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 1,594 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 10,098 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 8,504 |

| **High Growth Scenario** | **Units** |
|---|---|
| 20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning | 3,199 |
| 20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning | 17,845 |
| Effect of Proposed Rezoning | 14,646 |

# Summary by Current Zoning District

| | | Low-Growth | | | High-Growth | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current Zoning[3] | Number of Parcels | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units | Average Housing Likelihood, Current | Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed | Change in Housing Units |
| RH1 | 43,009 | 0.001% | 0.205% | 798 | 0.003% | 0.446% | 1,731 |
| RH2 | 26,486 | 0.002% | 0.259% | 576 | 0.005% | 0.565% | 1,250 |
| RH3_RM1 | 13,741 | 0.009% | 0.347% | 547 | 0.018% | 0.756% | 1,186 |
| Office/Commercial | 114 | 0.570% | 0.780% | 48 | 1.185% | 1.639% | 104 |
| Public | 239 | 0.060% | 1.450% | 3,483 | 0.122% | 2.560% | 4,814 |
| Density-Restricted Multifamily | 7,079 | 0.336% | 0.490% | 3,007 | 0.674% | 1.026% | 5,467 |
| Form-Based Multifamily | 2,053 | 0.725% | 0.725% | 46 | 1.502% | 1.502% | 94 |
| Total | 92,721 | | | 8,504 | | | 14,646 |

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

# Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

# Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

| | **Low Growth Scenario** | **High Growth Scenario** |
|---|---|---|
| Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions) | 8,041 | 13,615 |
| Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5] | 2.0% | 3.4% |
| Price Elasticity of Demand | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| Price Elasticity of Supply | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Percent change in housing prices | -2.5% | -4.2% |
| Corresponding change in condo prices[6] | -$24,500 | -$41,600 |
| Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7] | -$903 | -$1,529 |

# Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

| | Low Growth | High Growth |
|---|---:|---:|
| Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf) | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Disruption-relocation cost/sf | $190 | $190 |
| Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million) | $16 | $28 |

# REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

# Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

# Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

# Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

# Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

# Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

| Variable Description | Variable | Data Source |
|---|---|---|
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior | Construc_Cost_Real | a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100 |
| 10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior | Zillow_Price_Real | SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100 |
| Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | Calculated from Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space | zp_Public | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | Planning Department, Zoning Districts |
| Planning District dummy variables | DIST_<District Name> | Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | Intercept | (1.6226) | 1.2829 | 1.5998 | 0.2059 |
| Height limit for site in ft | Height_Ft | 0.0017 | 0.0007 | 4.9693 | 0.0258 |
| Area for lot in 1000 sq ft | Area_1000 | 0.0049 | 0.0009 | 30.6563 | 0.0000 |
| Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 5.0369 | 0.0248 |
| Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft | Bldg_SqFt_1000 | (0.0023) | 0.0007 | 10.7241 | 0.0011 |
| Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy) | Res_Dummy | (0.8231) | 0.1222 | 45.3669 | 0.0000 |
| Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy) | Historic | (1.0378) | 0.1271 | 66.6847 | 0.0000 |
| Real Construction Cost Variable | Construc_Cost_Real | (0.0992) | 0.0129 | 58.8929 | 0.0000 |
| SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real | Zillow_Price_Real | 0.0143 | 0.0053 | 7.1326 | 0.0076 |
| Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward | SDB_2016_5Plus | 0.6303 | 0.1608 | 15.3724 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Office/Commercial | zp_OfficeComm | 4.2634 | 0.4873 | 76.5337 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based | zp_DRMulti_RTO | 4.2450 | 0.4523 | 88.0989 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based | zp_FBDMulti_RTO | 5.0508 | 0.4640 | 118.4768 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair | zp_PDRInd | 3.4115 | 0.4790 | 50.7257 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Public/Open Space | zp_Public | 1.2491 | 0.8385 | 2.2190 | 0.1363 |
| Zoning = Redevelopment Area | zp_Redev | 4.5361 | 0.4999 | 82.3213 | 0.0000 |
| Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot) | zp_RH2 | 0.2674 | 0.6672 | 0.1607 | 0.6885 |
| Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft) | zp_RH3_RM1 | 1.3187 | 0.6064 | 4.7289 | 0.0297 |

# Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | StdErr | WaldChiSq | Prob>Chi Sq |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District = South Bayshore | DIST_SBayshore | (1.4824) | 0.3179 | 21.7380 | 0.0000 |
| District = Bernal Heights | DIST_BernalHts | (1.7011) | 0.6087 | 7.8100 | 0.0052 |
| District = South Central | DIST_Scentral | (1.7307) | 0.3867 | 20.0267 | 0.0000 |
| District = Central | DIST_Central | (1.1523) | 0.3353 | 11.8102 | 0.0006 |
| District = Buena Vista | DIST_BuenaVista | (2.5369) | 1.0188 | 6.2010 | 0.0128 |
| District = Northeast | DIST_Northeast | (1.4171) | 0.2539 | 31.1439 | 0.0000 |
| District = Western Addition | DIST_WestAddition | (0.6831) | 0.2362 | 8.3630 | 0.0038 |
| District = South of Market | DIST_SOMA | (0.0756) | 0.1903 | 0.1579 | 0.6911 |
| District = Inner Sunset | DIST_InnerSunset | (1.6187) | 0.4882 | 10.9939 | 0.0009 |
| District = Richmond | DIST_Richmond | (2.8019) | 0.5355 | 27.3716 | 0.0000 |
| District = Ingleside | DIST_Ingleside | (1.8670) | 0.4925 | 14.3711 | 0.0002 |
| District = Outer Sunset | DIST_OuterSunset | (2.6147) | 0.6098 | 18.3867 | 0.0000 |
| District = Marina | DIST_Marina | (1.2492) | 0.3253 | 14.7457 | 0.0001 |
| District = Mission | DIST_Mission | (1.0938) | 0.2380 | 21.1176 | 0.0000 |

*Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:*

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

# Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

| Variable Description | Variable | Coeff | St Error | T-Stat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10) | Env_1000_Area_Height | 0.4252 | 0.0159 | 26.72 |
| State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward) | SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull | 0.4385 | 0.0389 | 11.28 |
| Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted | Zoning_DR_EnvFull | (0.1601) | 0.0174 | (9.22) |

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

# Appendix: Model Performance

| **Logistic Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 3,369,573 |
| Number with Dependent Variable = 1 | 422 |
| Pseudo R-Square | 0.000611 |
| Max Rescaled R-Square | 0.244596 |

| **Units Regression** | |
|---|---|
| Number of Observations | 383 |
| R-Sq | 0.867779 |
| Adj R-Sq | 0.866735 |
| Dependent Mean Value | 81.87206 |
| Standard Error of Regression | 48.40184 |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_RH1 | C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1 |
| zp_RH2 | NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2 |
| zp_RH3_RM1 | RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO |
| zp_OfficeComm | C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_DRMulti_RTO | NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL |

# Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

| Zoning Variable | Zoning Districts |
|---|---|
| zp_Public | C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public |
| zp_FBDMulti_RTO | DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG |
| zp_PDRInd | DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2 |
| zp_Redev | HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL |

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning ("baseline"), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning ("policy"), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

# Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

# Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

# Staff Contact

**Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist** ted.egan@sfgov.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jane Natoli |
| **To:** | paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov |
| **Cc:** | gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf |

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--

**Jane Natoli (she/her)**
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950

Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

**Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development**
**Mayor Daniel Lurie**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)**
*October 29, 2025*

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction...fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions...that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

**Salim Damerdji**

Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

**Jane Natoli**

San Francisco Organizing Director,

YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

## Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

**"Soft Sites Method"**

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from “an analytical model,” and it is not at all “reasonable.”

**“Citywide Capacity Method”**

This method calculates what share of the city’s remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not “reasonabl[e]” in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with “exclusions”) divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students’ grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city’s statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city’s housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city’s calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city’s Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It’s therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city’s historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

**"Financial Feasibility Method"**

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | BOS Legislation, (BOS) |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | BOS Legislation, (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | FW: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701) |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 27, 2025 9:17:48 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf |

---

**From:** Kenneth Kim <ken.ei.kim@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 27, 2025 9:15 AM
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)

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

Dear Commission Secretary and Supervisors,

I support the Expanding Housing Choice / Family Zoning proposal and request a technical map correction for 875 Lombard Street (Block 0073, Lot 017B, APN 0073017B).

My parcel is shown as 40//40-R-4, while the immediately adjacent parcel (APN 0073018) and all parcels directly across Lombard Street are 40//50-R-4, all within RM-1. The attached Exhibit A illustrates a single-parcel discontinuity.

Extending the 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height one parcel west to include 875 Lombard would not change the underlying use (it remains RM-1) but would:

• restore consistent streetwall and block-face form,

• support gentle-density objectives in RM-1 under the Local Program framework, and

• add incremental Housing Element capacity without altering neighborhood character.

Thank you for considering this technical correction for inclusion in the final map clean-ups for Files 250700 / 250701.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Kim

Owner – 875 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94133

917-891-1805 | ken.ei.kim@gmail.com

Attachment: Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf


San Francisco Planning
Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)
Legend
Info
Layers
Imagery
PDF
Help
Legend
Rezoning September 2025 Ordinance (Board File 250700 - v3)
Proposed Local Program Height Limits (September 2025)
40'
50'
65'
85'
105'
120'
130'
140'
160'
180'
240'
250'
300'
350'
875 LOMBARD ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNI...
Search result
Proposed Height District (September 2025)
Zoom to
Parcel 0073017B
Block 0073
Lot 017B
Proposed Local Program Height 40//40-R-4
Proposed Base Height 40
Existing Height District 40-X
Supervisor District 3
Existing Zoning District RM-1
Proposed Zoning District No change
All opposite parcels: 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height
0073017B – 40//40-R-4 875 Lombard
0073018 -40//50-R-4 869 Lombard
Columbus Ave
Francisco St
Houston St
Water St
Mason St
Taylor St
Jones St
Jansen St
Greenwich St
Valparaiso St
Filbert St
Scotland St
Via Bufano
Stockton St
DiMaggio Playground
Michelangelo Playground
875 Lombard St (0073017B) – Single-parcel discontinuity in proposed Local Program Height (40//40-R-4 vs. 40//50-R-4 adjacent)
Source: San Francisco Planning Department – Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map, Sept 2025).
Esri Community Maps Contributors, California State Parks, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS
Powered by Esri

**From:** Tamila Wong
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 8:02:32 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

**From:** shelbyville500@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shelby Campbell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, October 25, 2025 1:32:37 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan resident, I oppose parts of Mayor Lurie's plan. Residents deserve the opportunity to have more input in the process.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Together, these plans prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I provided my comments to the Planning Department's proposed upzoning of the Sunset. I was very much in support of the upzoning of transportation corridors that run perpendicular to the ocean, with two exceptions:
1. Consider not upzoning past Sunset Blvd or maybe as far as 44th Avenue on these corridors, to preserve the coastal environment of the outer Sunset.
2. Strongly oppose high rises at the beach. If you grant an exception for the investor on Sloat, you will set a precedent for a row of high rises at the beach, destroying the open space and coastal environment that defines the Outer Sunset.

We hope you will take the neighborhood's comments into consideration in making decisions about our community.

Sincerely,
Shelby Campbell
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Vivienne Hay
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:56:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Vivienne Hay
vivienne.l.hay@gmail.com
1495 Golden Gate Avenue, Apt 207
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** eugenemccarthy63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eugene McCarthy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:44:26 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eugene McCarthy

**From:** Sophia Hagy
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 24, 2025 4:32:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,
Sophia Hagy
San Francisco community member and Paraeducator for SFUSD

Sophia Hagy
sophiahagy@gmail.com
1302 York Street
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:05:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Romalyn Schmaltz

ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
romalynschmaltz@gmail.com
740 Union St
San Francisco, California 94133-2747

**From:** Kate Blumberg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:10:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live in a rent-controlled apartment in D10. Over the 24 years we have lived here, we have seen the incredible benefits that more housing can bring to support a thriving local business community and a more walkable and vibrant neighborhood. But only do the small business districts sprinkled throughout our neighborhoods need more homes to thrive, the citizens of San Francisco need more homes to provide the flexibility and affordability that can help us stay in this great city even if our circumstances change.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes in every corner of our city — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

I know there are several amendments proposed, some of which make sense and others which would weaken the plan. I especially support providing funds and resources to small businesses to help them weather change and incentives for larger family units to be built. While in theory I like the idea of any incentive to get builders building, I don't think a strict time clock would help in these turbulent times.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Kate Blumberg
kate@acmetron.com
2002 22nd. St
San Francisco, California 94107-3204

**From:** Ted.Hexter@proton.me
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:03:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted.Hexter@proton.me
1670 Market Street Apt 68
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** elizbreilly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Reilly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:40:40 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Reilly
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Cheryl Meeker
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:58:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not be manipulated into destroying rent controlled units and small businesses with this zoning change.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cheryl Meeker
cherylmeeker@gmail.com
1296 Haight St Apt 28
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** rout.rishav@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:19:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Rishav Rout

rout.rishav@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** sayuri.anya@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:00:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94118

**From:** alvatenebrae@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:53:16 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning plan will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. It will accelerate displacement, enrich developers, and prioritize luxury units over homes for working people. Without significant amendments, this plan will make the housing crisis worse, not better.

There is a way forward that meets State density requirements while protecting renters, preserving small businesses, and delivering truly affordable housing. Any upzoning plan must include these transformative policies. Establish an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to guarantee a minimum of 50% genuinely affordable homes on large opportunity parcels. Protect all 100,000 rent-controlled homes – representing 200,000 people – from this plan. Our elected officials have already prioritized preserving people's homes.

Require more, not fewer, affordable units. Reject any scheme to swap BMR homes for market-rate units. Raise the BMR inclusionary requirement to 20% on-site so that new construction actually benefits working San Franciscans. Build for families. Require 50% of units to be 2-3 bedrooms with communal living spaces. Protect small businesses. Prohibit demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Require developers to cover relocation costs starting at $150k and provide turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced tenants.

Ensure workers who build our city receive a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements across all projects. Protect public space and our coast. Prevent the privatization or development of protected waterfront land. Go beyond the Mayor's plan. Push a real affordable housing financing strategy. Leverage state and federal support instead of relying on private developers or Downtown donors.

San Francisco's housing crisis is a product of systemic inequality. It is time for bold, people-first policies that confront developers' greed, protect working people, and ensure housing is a right, not a commodity. We need leadership that will fight for the city's residents, not developers' profits.

alvatenebrae@gmail.com
1177 Market St Apt 1432
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** slpretti@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Pretti
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:12:17 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I've lived in the Richmond district for over 30 years. These changes would be devasting to renters like me, to seniors, and to families living and working in SF. This proposed plan is NOT a viable way to create affordable housing. It is reckless and harmful and will leave many people without housing. Also, I think it's reprehensible to put small businesses at risk. Neighborhood communities and small businesses are what define SF, NOT luxury high rises designed for the wealthy.

PLEASE work to scale back this very dangerous upzoning plan.

Sincerely,
Sharon Pretti
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Charlie Musoff
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
**Subject:** All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:11:21 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Charlie Musoff
charliemusoff@gmail.com
507 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** mary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY THOMAS
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:47:05 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS  WE WILL NEVER HAVE ENOUGH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNLESS YOU RAISE THE FEE DEVELOPERS HAVE TO PAY IF THEY OMIT THE 15% AFFORDABLE HOUSING... THE CURRENT FEES ARE NOT HIGH ENOUGH AND JUST BURRIED IN THE SALE PRICE OF UNITS AND GIVES SAN FRANCISCANS WHO NEEED LOW INCOME HOUSING NO HOPE... JUST MORE RISING COSTS OF HOUSING - DO THE MATH

Sincerely,
MARY THOMAS
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Olivia Page
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:22:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Olivia Page

Olivia Page
oliviaindigopage@gmail.com
780 Shotwell St
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** jeanettercool@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Cool
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:21:16 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeanette Cool
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** Nick DeRenzi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
**Subject:** All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:33:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Nick D

Nick DeRenzi
nickderenziphoto@gmail.com
2808 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Cecily Gardner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:00:28 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cecily Gardner
gardner.cecily@gmail.com
3627 21st St
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** ramon lazo
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:41:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
R Lazo

ramon lazo
9guj0037j@hotmail.com
193 gladstone drive
san francisco, ca

**From:** Thomas Plagemann
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:31:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Thomas Plagemann

Thomas Plagemann
thosplag@sbcglobal.net
762 Capp St
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:48:42 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** Julia Diaz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:18:53 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Julia Diaz
jmdiaz2016@g.ucla.edu
3841 24th st
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** David Alexander
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:33:00 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I am a parent of two SFUSD students. We badly need housing for families on the Westside and beyond. The current housing availability is untenable and needs to change.

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

thank you,

Dave Alexander

David Alexander
alexanderdavid415@gmail.com
2806 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:31:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Marlo Dowell

msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** nieberding3@gmail.com
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:27:35 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

nieberding3@gmail.com
18 10th St Apt 640
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** Edward Sullivan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:14:23 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Edward Sullivan
efsullyjr@aol.com
2448 Great Hwy Apt 14
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Jim Chappell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:38:29 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jim Chappell
jimchappellsf@gmail.com
708 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Francesca P
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:57:28 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Francesca P
ballets.lank_0z@icloud.com
Po Box 460703
San Francisco, California 94146

**From:** Ben Wessel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** I support the family zoning plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:28:11 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Hi Board of Supervisors --

My name is Ben Wessel, I live in the Inner Sunset, and I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. This year, my wife and I were fortunate enough to move out of our small rent-controlled apartment into a condo on Judah Street, an opportunity that made it easier for us to decide to have a child -- and our daughter Mika was born just two weeks ago! Unfortunately, for many of our friends who we've met in the neighborhood over the last ten years, the cost to move into a bigger place or even buy a place was too high for them to stay in the city. We've lost four different families from our friend crew who have all moved to Oakland to find more affordable places to live or more space. Each of these families told us they would have stayed in SF if they could have found a place like our condo.

I guess I write all this because I just wish San Francisco was a place that my friends could see themselves for years to come, the way that I do. I don't know if this plan will get that done, but it seems better than doing nothing. Let me know if you have better ideas.

Thanks,
Ben

PS: Here's the boilerplate language from the Housing Action Coalition that I think you've probably all read already: "San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future."

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration."

Ben Wessel
benkwessel@gmail.com

937 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Eric Baird
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:26:44 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Eric Baird
erichansb@gmail.com
141 Scott Street
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Meg Kammerud
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Please Support Family Zoning Plan - SF Needs More Homes of All Sorts in Every Neighborhood
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:18:18 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I am a long-time District 8 home owner and support bringing more housing to my neighborhood -- and every neighborhood across our city. We must not let individuals or individual neighborhoods dismantle a plan that will make all of San Francisco better and more livable, somewhere my children may be able to not only grow up but stay.

I support Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance.

I strongly oppose any proposal to exclude residential sites from rezoning or impose any restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and the original plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Sincerely,
Meg Kammerud
Glen Park

Meg Kammerud
meg.kammerud@gmail.com
810 Congo St
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Ted Neranchi
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:01:05 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted Neranchi
tneranchi@gmail.com
296 Guttenberg St
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Tim Colen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:18:40 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tim Colen
timcolen@gmail.com
1501 Greenwich St, Unit 502
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Alan Billingsley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:54:35 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alan Billingsley
alanbillingsley215@gmail.com
215 Eureka St
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** leobilly69@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:07:54 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

William T. Heaton

leobilly69@gmail.com
168 Hyde Street Apt 206
San Francisco, California 94102-3656

**From:** Megan Bute
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:12:22 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Megan Bute
wikis-scows.4t@icloud.com
273 29th St
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** John Oda
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:43:19 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

John Oda
jandjoda@aol.com
2000 post
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Jason Fischel
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Redevelopment Plan is too timid
**Date:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:21:37 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

The proposed redevelopment plan will not increase housing enough in SF. Look at Austin, we can bring down rents, but we need to greatly decrease the burden of regulations and make SF a city for all.

Cheers,
Jason

Jason Fischel
fischelj@udel.edu
227 Clinton park
San Francisco, ca, California 94103

**From:** Steven Susaña-Castillo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 11:29:49 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Although I think the plan doesn't go far enough, I think this gets in the right direction of undoing wrongs. Historically, San Francisco's zoning (and downzoning in the mid 20th century) was used as a tool to keep neighborhoods exclusive and keep out low income folks, immigrants, and/or racial minorities. (Many wealthier neighborhoods like Forest Hill and Pac Heights have used their City Hall connections to keep out minorities like the Japanese in the 40s from their neighborhoods by ensuring that mixed used zoning was banned and that the newly arriving immigrants could not set up their businesses there). Its scars are still evident today.

The Environmental Impact Report and a Chronicle article back in 1978 rightfully pointed out what would happen if we doubled down on restrictive zoning. Both warned that such restrictive zoning would cause San Francisco to become an exclusive playground for the rich, would deny the ability of low income people to live (and stay) here, would skyrocket home prices, and would inevitably lead to a housing shortage. We are now living the consequences.

Personally, we cannot call ourselves a progressive and/or liberal city when we are actively defending keeping intact zoning that is a derived from redlining. When you revisit Chronicle articles, newspaper cartoons, speeches/public comments from past supervisors, etc, you begin to pick up that these zoning rules were initiated from a standpoint of xenophobia and racism. By attempting to undo these policies, we are declaring that we want a San Francisco that is for everyone and that we are not just giving lipservice to these ideals we say we have.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and

collaboration.

Steven Susaña-Castillo
coolsteven2@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Jen Rosas
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 10:36:02 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. Especially as a resident of the Outter Richmond, we need more density, and more housing options.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jen Rosas
jenmrosas@yahoo.com
825 La Playa St #228
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Rachel Sheinbein
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 10:09:14 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Rachel

Rachel Sheinbein
rachel.sheinbein@gmail.com
2621 harrison st
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** Laurie Dewan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 9:57:53 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. My grandparents came to San Francisco in the 1930s and raised four children on a working-class income. While I am proud to be raising my children here too, I see so many families who simply can't make it work - and I wonder how long my husband and I can continue to manage the high cost of housing.

To me, the Family Zoning plan means taking this city I love into a bright, diverse future where families and working people can thrive.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Laurie Dewan
laurie.dewan@gmail.com
3362 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Lada Shchekleina
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 9:20:30 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Lada Shchekleina
ladannn@gmail.com
555 MISSION ROCK STR, APT # 630
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94158

**From:** Tyler Pullen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 9:16:47 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan, preferably without the amendment casually excluding the literal majority of rental buildings (that are rent-controlled) from the plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes, and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love and the work they need.

Part of me wants the state to take over a preempt our land use rules -- which, to be clear, are the very stakes we are playing with -- because of the seeming inability of our local government to competently and earnestly allow enough housing to meet demand. But I'd love to avoid tempting that outcome by enthusiastically supporting the functional upzoning reflected in the original plan (and even more than that, ideally). Market rate housing will not single-handedly solve our affordability crisis, but we have all the evidence in the world that restricting housing of all types only makes the entire situation worse, especially so for the low income households we purport to care so much about.

This barely meets the state-mandated Housing Element goals which represents the bare minimum of meeting our city's long-underserved housing obligations, and amendments like the exclusion of rent-controlled buildings nakedly undermine the spirit of the plan in a way that is performatively progressive but functionally regressive. Our city's low income households (of which I am a part) live daily the consequences of our housing crisis most severely, and plans that continue to resist the improvement and expansion of our housing stock worsen our outcomes in both relative and absolute terms.

I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan without the rent-controlled unit exemption, and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tyler Pullen

tpullen28@gmail.com
3477 1/2 17th St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Beth O"Leary
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 9:11:10 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Beth O'Leary
beth@oleary.con
445 Baden St
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Carlos Abela
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan need to be
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 8:34:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not change zoning in the Sunset District Leave zoning changes up to the people who live in that zone. Some, like the downtown area, would welcome it. Others, like in the Sunset District, do not want it. You can build plenty of housing by converting offices and building high rises where they already exist.
Sincerely,
Carlos Abela

Carlos Abela
abela@mac.com
1266 40th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Charissa Schaefer
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:53:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I know how gentrification starts and this upzoning plan is not in service of the people who live here. Please choose us over the corporations who would like to change the face of these neighborhoods. This city is already hugely expensive to live in. Don't make it worse.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Charissa Schaefer

Charissa Schaefer
cbs.music.news@gmail.com
1420 Turk St, Apt 1101
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Marty Cerles
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:41:23 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Marty Cerles
martycerles@gmail.com
2940 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** George Ference
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:32:35 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

George Ference
michael.ference@gmail.com
1386 31st Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** David Downs
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:28:44 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

D11 voter in support of the Family Zoning Plan.

Build, baby, build.

David Downs
daviddownspresents@pm.me
251 Farallones St.
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Cora M. Shaw
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cora M. Shaw
daft-sniper-0e@icloud.com
451 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Mark Macy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:04 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Amendments I Support:

Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance, and the Mayor has signaled support.

Amendments I Oppose:

Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Mark Macy
markm@macyarchitecture.com
241 10th Avenue #1
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Elliot Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 7:21:36 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Elliot Schwartz
elliot.schwartz@gmail.com
2828 Bryant Street
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Heather Davies
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Real Affordability Housing in D4
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 6:56:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Davies

Heather Davies
daviesva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Sharon Bradbury
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 6:32:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sharon Bradbury
sharcrow@yahoo.com
839 Haight St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Lynetta Oliver
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 27, 2025 1:00:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lynetta Oliver
lynettaoliver@gmail.com
527 Balboa
San Francisco , California 94118

**From:** lunbeck@sbcglobal.net
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
**Cc:** CPC.SF.Housing.Choice
**Subject:** Public Comment: Family Zoning Plan -- follow-up to 10/20 meeting of LUT Committee
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 12:40:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please accept the following comment on the ongoing Family Zoning Plan (upzoning initiative) under consideration:

I live in Lakeside and have lived in San Francisco for over 35 years. I am deeply concerned about the density decontrol provision in the Family Zoning Plan.
Blanket density decontrol will irretrievably devastate West Side neighborhoods.
It's often remarked that SF is a city of neighborhoods. Many are low-density residential. Uncontrolled high-density development permitted virtually anywhere in low-density residential blocks will destroy local neighborhoods by tearing at the hard-won fabric of local community woven over the years.
It appears blanket density decontrol was introduced to reduce the plan's maximum building heights. Proponents disingenuously claim that preserving existing 40' limits on the West Side should allay concerns that neighborhoods will be dramatically transformed. This is misleading. Very few dwellings in the West Side now reach maximum heights, with the vast majority well under 30'. Newly permitted multifamily dwellings will certainly push toward the 40' maximum, towering over the other dwellings in their blocks, permanently destroying such blocks' longstanding character and architectural integrity.
Worse, density decontrol would enshrine – in perpetuity – this devastating threat to neighborhood integrity by allowing such out-of-place development anywhere and at any time. It's a permanent Sword of Damocles threatening virtually every West Side block, with no recourse once this predictable disaster begins to unfold.
Density decontrol will create a crazy quilt of inappropriate, out-of-place new development opportunistically scattered across the entire West Side. No block will be safe from ruination. Even one isolated large new multifamily dwelling will damage the surrounding neighborhood's character. Instead of unnecessarily putting every dwelling on every block in the West Side at risk, dense development should be concentrated in defined zones, as embodied in earlier iterations of upzoning maps.
Further, density decontrol could change every parcel's highest and best use to multifamily development. Single-family homes will turn into de facto teardowns, discouraging maintenance and improvements. This itself is a formula for widespread neighborhood deterioration – even if no new development has occurred in the vicinity.
The Planning Department contends that density decontrol is the only way to achieve State mandates. This claim appears dubious, as earlier versions of the proposed zoning map

achieved State mandates without incorporating blanket density decontrol.
Please remove the pernicious blanket density decontrol provision from the City's upzoning plan.

Thank you for your consideration.
Yours sincerely,
Robert Lunbeck
150 Junipero Serra Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** sfdavidbancroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Bancroft
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:53:34 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 54 year D2 resident.

Don't Do It!

The Mayor's upzoning plan for Lombard St. will create a canyon entrance to SF, cleave Cow Hollow from the Marina and Chestnut St., and make those neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Where's the affordable housing?

No competent  city planner would ever choose this as part of  a viable solution for SF's housing needs!

Don't Do It.

David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

Sincerely,
David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** jeannelu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeannette Luini
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:41:56 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeannette Luini
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:38:18 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
George Sery

**From:** scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:34:01 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):You will destroy one of the world's most beautiful cities if you allow this zoning to pass. I WILL NEVER VOTE FOR, AND ACTIVELY CAMPAIGN AGAINST, ANY SF ELECTED OFFICIAL WHO SUPPORTS THIS MONSTROSITY. The San Francisco northern waterfront should be a UNESCO World Heritage site instead of a new Miami Beach or Manhattan. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world, thanks to its unique geography and views and the respect with which it has been developed up to now. Its beauty is dependent on the harmony of the city with its surroundings, and the human scale at which it is built. It is fully built up. There is no more room unless you want to destroy a beautiful community that has evolved in harmony with its environment. The neighborhood does not want more development. POLL US IF YOU HAVE ANY DOUBT. Notre Dame in Paris was exactly rebuilt as it was after the fire, because the French knew its importance. Where are the similar leaders here? Who will rebuild San Francisco after the aesthetically clueless, money-grabbing developers who can't tell a properly functioning neighborhood from a hole in ground are done defacing our magnificent neighborhood, a magical place that attracts visitors from all over the world?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** jandckehoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Kehoe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:17:46 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a lifelong San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

While I know we need housing that working people can afford, this is not the answer. PLEASE OPPOSE THIS!

Sincerely,
Christine Kehoe
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Altobelli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:04:29 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Affordable housing is necessary, luxury towers will not provide an answer. This looks hasty & a land grab which irreconcilablely destroy not only the scale of our city but the citizens that live work & have small businesses  will be permanently displaced. . San Francisco is not a play ground for the rich , it's a city made up of people from all economic levels, that's what we should value & protect . There's always a way . Let's not hear our elected politicians say our hands are tied & we won't give our citizens a chance to disagree, comment or discuss. Don't shut the people & our city out . Don't turn San Francisco into a billionaire city , for the rich , for corporate businesses. No one wants that .

Sincerely,
Jay Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** jayelliott415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Elliott
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:27:48 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

WE are the stewards of our beautiful city, not Sacramento. They are the ugly step sister hellbent on ruining Cinderella. San Francisco has made mistakes before (Fillmore), let's not do it again! Many brave San Franciscans have fought against development that would harm, and because of their sacrifices and subsequent wins, we have Mt. Davidson (my neighborhood) as open space and many other treasures (Tea and Cookies ladies saved the Bay when the Sierra Club couldn't be bothered!). We can do better than Sacramento and as a Charter city, we have the right to. Strategic growth is smart, mandates are not!

That';s why, as a native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors (and haven't we seen how the billionaire class is ruining our country!) while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Jay Elliott
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:21:31 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The building at 2550 Irving is across the street from our apartment. This building is far too big for existing transit services and there is little to no parking. I strongly suggest repurposing existing commercial vacant buildings in/around downtown that are along multiple transit lines into affordable housing vs adding high density housing throughout SF before ensuring adequate transit lines and parking.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:11:34 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:42:34 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

**From:** terence.y.chu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terence Chu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:07:43 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terence Chu
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** jg1964chi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Albertson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:50:32 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Joan Albertson
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | BOS Legislation, (BOS) |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | BOS Legislation, (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | FW: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701) |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 27, 2025 9:17:48 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf |

---

**From:** Kenneth Kim <ken.ei.kim@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 27, 2025 9:15 AM
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)

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

Dear Commission Secretary and Supervisors,

I support the Expanding Housing Choice / Family Zoning proposal and request a technical map correction for 875 Lombard Street (Block 0073, Lot 017B, APN 0073017B).

My parcel is shown as 40//40-R-4, while the immediately adjacent parcel (APN 0073018) and all parcels directly across Lombard Street are 40//50-R-4, all within RM-1. The attached Exhibit A illustrates a single-parcel discontinuity.

Extending the 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height one parcel west to include 875 Lombard would not change the underlying use (it remains RM-1) but would:

• restore consistent streetwall and block-face form,

• support gentle-density objectives in RM-1 under the Local Program framework, and

• add incremental Housing Element capacity without altering neighborhood character.

Thank you for considering this technical correction for inclusion in the final map clean-ups for Files 250700 / 250701.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Kim

Owner – 875 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94133

917-891-1805 | ken.ei.kim@gmail.com

Attachment: Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf


San Francisco Planning
Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)
Legend
Info
Layers
Imagery
PDF
Help
Legend
Rezoning September 2025 Ordinance (Board File 250700 - v3)
Proposed Local Program Height Limits (September 2025)
40'
50'
65'
85'
105'
120'
130'
140'
160'
180'
240'
250'
300'
350'
875 LOMBARD ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNI...
Search result
Proposed Height District (September 2025)
Zoom to
Parcel 0073017B
Block 0073
Lot 017B
Proposed Local Program Height 40//40-R-4
Proposed Base Height 40
Existing Height District 40-X
Supervisor District 3
Existing Zoning District RM-1
Proposed Zoning District No change
All opposite parcels: 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height
0073017B – 40//40-R-4 875 Lombard
0073018 -40//50-R-4 869 Lombard
Columbus Ave
Francisco St
Water St
Mason St
Houston St
Taylor St
Jones St
Jansen St
Greenwich St
Valparaiso St
Filbert St
Scotland St
Via Bufano
Stockton St
DiMaggio Playground
Michelangelo Playground
875 Lombard St (0073017B) – Single-parcel discontinuity in proposed Local Program Height (40//40-R-4 vs. 40//50-R-4 adjacent)
Source: San Francisco Planning Department – Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map, Sept 2025).
Esri Community Maps Contributors, California State Parks, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS
Powered by Esri

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 13 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966, 251071, 251072, and 251073 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:09:23 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 13 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf |

Hello,

Please see attached 13 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan
251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** James Nelson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:02:33 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
James Nelson

James Nelson
jimmie.nelson@gmail.com
3900 Adeline Street, Unit 309
Emeryville, California 94608

**From:** Michelle Santos
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:19:14 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michelle Santos
michelllesantoss@gmail.com
39 Sycamore st
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Anne Eunice
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:05:19 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Anne Eunice
annemarieeunice1968@gmail.com
3850 18th Street Apt 203
SF, California 94114

**From:** Cassia Brill
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:33:18 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cassia Brill
cassiagbrill@gmail.com
695 John Muir Dr apt f102
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94132

**From:** mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 2:32:02 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps and just do the minimum to meet the State requirements. Further rezoning can wait while the voters weigh in.
Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

- Exempt all parcels with rent controlled buildings from the Plan.

-Require that any and all development on city-owned land must be 100% affordable for working families.

-Exempt the Coastal land from the Plan.

The Plan destroys the priceless treasure that is San Francisco, and will erase what attracts the world's tourists to this destination. People like it here because of its' human scale and trees. They are not coming to see luxury towers. Do not prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the citizens.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** debra.riat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of deborah riat
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 4:27:16 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Your up zoning plan is NOT good for our neighborhood. It is ridiculous for you to propose 6 story buildings next to 1 story single family houses. It is especially bad to go west of 20th avenue on Geary, California, Clement, Fulton with this OVERKILL CRAZY ZONING PLAN designed to pay off developers for your campaign contributions. We all know that you launder these funds into your own personal accounts. Why do you attack us in this way? The housing shortage is diminishing rapidly. AI and robotics are eating jobs and will start to do so more rapidly in the near future. The border is closed to illegal immigration and illegal immigrants are being deported and encouraged to leave of their own volition. YOU ARE BEHIND THE TIMES! I am asking you to come to your senses and STOP making WAR on the people of San Francisco!!! This radical zoning plan is NOT necessary, and it is BAD for our city.

Also, why do you continue to let drug addicts RUIN SAN FRANCISCO? Frequently my friends tell me horror stories about riding MUNI. Yesterday the story was a drug addict was asleep on the bus and his pit bull was running up and down and sitting wherever it wanted. People were terrorized. PEOPLE ARE AFRAID TO RIDE MUNI. All these stabbing murders we have had in past months, where crazed drug addicts kill people for no reason. And this morning a video of a crazy woman stabbing a restaurant owner with a knife from his kitchen. THIS IS INSANITY AND IT IS ALL ON YOU!!!!! Drug addition is not a victimless crime. I live near Sutro Heights park. I have seen over 5 dead bodies pulled out of there in the last few years. This was not happening 10 years ago. Taking drugs is illegal and these people should be arrested and detoxed for their own good and for the good of our community.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,

deborah riat
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** rosie447@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosie Gozali
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 6:43:43 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rosie Gozali

**From:** Nadya Williams
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 7:03:56 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Nadya Williams
nadyanomad@gmail.com
1436 Grant Ave. # 10
San Francisco , California 94133

**From:** Sarah Kliban
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 7:25:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

There are many reasons that this plan does not work, which are listed below. But in addition to those ideas, let me present to you that a lot of the cities money comes from tourists who see the city through film and television and print. A lot of us work in the film, business. What this new legislation will do is change the landscape of the city. It will change the views of the city and the presentation of the city. This means that the city that people are coming to visit is not going to be the same, but especially, for my industry, it means that people who like to make films here to show off the views will not be as attracted to bringing their projects here. Especially in district 3, which is the most filmed section of San Francisco in the past several decades.
Additionally, the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not

side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sarah Kliban
Casting Director
Fifth generation San Francisco resident

Sarah Kliban
casting27@gmail.com
250 Columbus Avenue
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** Madison Wise
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:01:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I want you have a future myself and others in the City of San Francisco. We need more adorable housing not less.

Sincerely,

Madison Wise
Internal Organizer, SEIU-USWW

Madison Wise
unlit_frame3x@icloud.com
930 Sutter Street, Apt. 104
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Afrodisia Cuevas
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:05:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Afrodisia Cuevas

Afrodisia Cuevas
afrodisiacuevas@gmail.com
190 Alhambra St.
San Francisco, California 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | jim keith |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); SauterStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Conner, Kate (CPC); Cityattorney; BOS Clerks Office (BOS); Mayor, MYR (MYR); Low, Jen (BOS); Farrah, Michael (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; cityattorney.legislative@sfgov.org; SFhousingInfo |
| **Subject:** | URGENT! Please Correct Exclusion of Property from Family Zoning Ordinance |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:40:39 PM |

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Tanner, Supervisor Melgar, Supervisor Mahmood, Supervisor Sauter, Supervisor Dorsey,

My name is James Keith, Managing Member of Midtown Lands LLC. We are the owners of a **3-acre parcel (Block 2724, Lot 004),** also known as **402 Dellbrook Ave**. It has come to my attention that this property was **mistakenly excluded from the parcel list in the proposed Family Zoning Ordinance**. Upon reviewing the legislative parcel number list, I confirmed that our property is not included, which appears to be an error.

**This parcel is located well within the boundaries of the proposed Family Zoning Ordinance and represents a prime opportunity to address the city's critical need for additional housing**. The exclusion of our property undermines the ordinance's goal of expanding housing opportunities and must be rectified before the next reading of the legislation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the rezoning process.

I respectfully request **that all necessary steps** be taken to correct this oversight and include our property, Block 2724, Lot 004 (402 Dellbrook Ave), in the Family Zoning Ordinance. Please confirm receipt of this request and provide guidance on any further actions required to ensure our property is included in the rezoning.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. I am available to discuss this further or provide additional documentation as needed.

Sincerely, James Keith

Managing Member, Midtown Lands
415-317-2039

**From:** Tricia Powell
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:36:19 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tricia Powell
triciapowell@gmail.com
3270 21st St, 103
San Francisco, California 94110

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 406 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:43:02 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 406 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 406 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** kaurmona35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mona Kaur
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:09:33 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear elected officials and planning committees,
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Destroying one neighborhood to give to another is not community building.

Sincerely,
Mona Kaur
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** Carolina Pistone
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 8:52:21 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Carolina

Carolina Pistone
carolpistone2@gmail.com
1750 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** Patrick Marks
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:03:04 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Patrick Marks

Patrick Marks
patrickjmarks@sbcglobal.net
4192 24th St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Sarah Tang
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:20:19 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sarah

Sarah Tang
sarah.tang62@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94134

**From:** sharongadberry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Gadberry
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:10:43 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sharon Gadberry
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** taylorjasper0@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JASPER TAYLOR GAITHER
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:00:33 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
JASPER TAYLOR GAITHER
San Francisco, CA 94102

**From:** Molly Hayden
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:28:10 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Molly Hayden

Molly Hayden
molly.hayden@me.com
144a Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Christina Gonzalez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:34:00 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Christina Gonzalez

Christina Gonzalez
christygirl17@msn.com
150 Clinton Park
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** sumnernicole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicole Sumner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:41:20 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nicole Sumner
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** Dennis Moninger
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:00:06 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dennis Moninger
democratic1948@gmail.com
1330 bush apt 4k
S.f., California 94109

**From:** ccwalk5ege@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:11:44 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

ccwalk5ege@gmail.com
709 Frederick street
San Francisco , California 94117

**From:** jgburgess1936@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Burgess
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:12:52 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janet Burgess
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** stephanieteelmusic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Teel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:00:31 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I can see tearing down the old Motel6 on Lincoln but where else?

Sincerely,
Stephanie Teel

**From:** Amy Rathbone
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:34:54 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Amy Rathbone

Amy Rathbone
amyrathbone@gmail.com
499 Alabama St. #112
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Kevin Eisenstaedt
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:58:30 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kevin Eisenstaedt
kevinonroscoe@hotmail.com
350 Turk Street
SF, California 94102

**From:** PENNY SULLIVAN
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:15:35 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I am in a wheelchair and must live near my daughter due to a stroke. I cannot find anything as it is. I live near my daughter and have for 5 yeas. Every year the rent goes up! What will happen to me?

Sincerely,
Penny Sullivan

PENNY SULLIVAN
prnnys479@gmail.com
965 Sutter #709
Sanfrancisco , 96081

**From:** sfwendy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wendy Portnuff
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:18:55 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Wendy Portnuff
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** alejandragoldstar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alejandra Cisnero
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:21:55 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alejandra Cisnero
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** pugaykm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Pugay
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:03:15 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Pugay
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Imme Staeffler
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:11:03 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Imme Staeffler
immestaeffler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** jacqueline jones
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:14:32 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jacqueline jones
jackiej2242@gmail.com
91 Blue Creek Overlook
Carbondale, Colorado 81623

**From:** Katarina Kauftheil
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:28:41 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Katarina Kauftheil
kmkauftheil@gmail.com
620 Jones
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** Gabriella Seatris
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:31:07 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco wouldn't be the creative, desirable place it is without affordable home and rent controlled units to protect artists, young entrepreneurs, small business owners, families and more from losing their homes.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Gabriella Seatris
gseatris@gmail.com
2843 geary blvd
San francisco , California 94118

**From:** Michael Faklis
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:34:03 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michael Faklis
michael_faklis@thelonelliberal.ud

San Francisco, California 94111

**From:** Melanie Mandich
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:35:22 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I am long-term renter and active volunteer in my City (NERT, DHIC). Displacement would force me to leave the City. I've rented my current apartment since 1982, have no living relatives and depend on my home for security. Having major XSF developers or hedge funds purchase buildings and convert them into condos is unconscionable. There are many more like me...and we all vote! Sincerely, Melanie Mandich

Melanie Mandich
mmandich@comcast.net
390 liberty street, Apt 7
San francisco, California 94114

**From:** Claudia Molina
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:39:34 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Claudia Molina
molinaclaudia21@gmail.com
439 Arlington Street
San Francisco, California 94131

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | betsy.eddy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betsy Eddy |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:42 AM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's Upzoning plan will lead to the destruction of many historic buildings and destroy the character of our neighborhoods so that developer's can make huge amounts of money.

Sincerely,
Betsy Eddy
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** sherrichard@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Daniel ONEill
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:44 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and living in the Cow Hollow neighborhood for the past 29 years and previously 35 years in the Richmond district, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I was a builder of maximum 4-story apartments and proud to provide housing while keeping the neighborhoods in tact.

I am asking you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

Please listen to the people who live here and care about maintaining the homes and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Daniel ONEill
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Rita Pisciotta
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:48:53 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Rita Pisciotta
rbinsf@earthlink.net
2048 Stockton st
san francisco, California 94133-2026

**From:** sherrichard61@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherrie Richard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:56:19 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Cow Hollow. I am an owner of 2 rental cindos here. I care about the quality of life my rental units provide and the income it affords me to be retired and living in this great.neighborhood!

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Please listen to the people who live in these neighborhoods and have small businesses NOT to someone in an office in City Hall looking at pieces of PAPER!!

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

We are real! The paper in the desks of these planners are not real!

Sincerely,
Sherrie Richard
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Fiona Thao
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:58:21 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Fiona Thao
fionathao823@gmail.com
895 Pacific Ave
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** neyce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janeyce Ouellette
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 9:46:16 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janeyce Ouellette

**From:** Jane van Hoven
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 9:54:58 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Real San Franciscans, we who love this city and call it home, are sick of what's been happening to our city. We're sick of seeing our friends and neighbors forced to move and feeling that pressure ourselves while our neighborhoods lose what makes them our neighborhoods. This is a time to take a stand and protect Ssn Francisco.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening

– the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jane van Hoven
darkrainbowkittens@gmail.com
1233 California St, Apt 312
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** bestevenson1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bonnie Stevenson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:14:37 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bonnie Stevenson
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Sarah Bouldin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:51:10 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sarah Bouldin

Sarah Bouldin
sbouldin@rainbow.coop
39 Lapidge St
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** Maggie Shiple
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:52:36 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maggie Shiple
maggieshiple@gmail.com
1298 Funston Ave, Apt 2
San Francisco , California 94122

**From:** Evette Mercado
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:18:34 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Evette Mercado

Evette Mercado
evettem26@gmail.com
801 Sutter St. 108
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** steve.t@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steve Taormina
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 11:40:22 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a small business owner for 23 years in San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, Dont sellout the city to with the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, by transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Keep the city clean and not more expensive to live in.

Steve

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

As a small business owner for 23 years in San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, Dont sellout the city to with the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, by transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Keep the city clean and not more expensive to live in.

Steve

Sincerely,
Steve Taormina
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Heather Black
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:18:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Black
heathermoonblack@gmail.com
526 Taraval St
San Francisco, California 94116-2510

**From:** Douglas Freelon
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:36:41 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Douglas Freelon
dn.freelon13@gmail.com
1629 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Abigail Alderson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:12:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Abigail Alderson
abagaillalderson@mac.com
1864 48Th Avenue , 4
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Erin Antunez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Erin Antunez
antunezacupuncture@gmail.com
5 Chilton ave
San Francisco , California 94131

**From:** Marc Bruno
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Marc Bruno
marcabruno2025@gmail.com
15 Nobles Alley, Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** Jeremi Rebecca Hanson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:49:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jeremi Rebecca Hanson
jeremihanson@gmail.com
3460 16th st, Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Aaron Hopkins
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 2:09:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hopkins
Ahopkins425@me.com
851 34th Ave
San Francisco, 94121

**From:** Virginia Barker
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 3:47:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Virginia Barker
v.barker@att.net
200 Alhambra St #17
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** juithrydell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Rydell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:14:32 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS I love my neighborhood and purchased a home in this area for a safe peaceful place to live. We are mostly single family homes and some units. It is not congested and I am able to park on my block when I return home. The value of the homes in this area will drop if it turns into a congested area and with no parking. I am an elderly person who would find it difficult if I had to walk up this hill. PLEASE LEAVE OUR AREA AS IS. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judith Rydell
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** chue33333@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ed chu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:28:14 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): There are many members of our church who live all over San Francisco, many could use affordable housing. Your upzoning map would disrupt much needed housing for those who need affordable housing. Please keep those people in need when you make your plans. Please keep ALL San Franciscans in mind in your planning.

Sincerely,
ed chu
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** mesa797@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Douglas Gower
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:35:03 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

These are the types of rushed changes that have been suggested and in some cases implemented in the past that are either regrettable in their implementation, or thankfully never realized. We don't need a city of stalled projects and vacant lots serving no positive use.

Sincerely,
Douglas Gower
San Francisco, CA 94107

**From:** Ginger Hamilton
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 5:48:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
I am a stage 4 cancer patient who has been fighting my landlord of 27 years to not evict me.

I'm currently in treatment and can not afford to move. I need to remain in San Francisco to continue my medical treatment. My life depends on renter's right for affordable housing to maintain my housing and chemotherapy treatment. Please help long time residents such as myself to have affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Ginger Hamilton

Ginger Hamilton
gingerhami@earthlink.net
270 Pennsylvania Ave
San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** jdemeza@yahoo.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:50:25 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

jdemeza@yahoo.com
160 EDDY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94102

**From:** pwchu99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Chu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 8:53:16 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT: I live near West Portal and it is perfect the way it is. Don't change something that works and isn't broken. Don't make the it harder for the middle class to live in this city where I was born and raised.

Sincerely,
Patricia Chu
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** v.barker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Virginia Barker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 10:12:02 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

And this is a betrayal of your duty to work in the best interests of your constituents.

Sincerely,
Virginia Barker
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** ruthwwenzel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ruth W. Wenzel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:01:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): We still need homes & jobs for the people already here! Don't take small businesses & the homes of those who work in these places!

Sincerely,
Ruth W. Wenzel
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** LaNiesha Pedroza
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:02:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

LaNiesha Pedroza
laniesha@icloud.com
1808 Fulton St, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** McKenzie Campagna
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:02:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

McKenzie Campagna
renkiyo7@gmail.com
350 Arballo Dr. Apt 9F
San Francisco, California 94132

**From:** Melanie Dorson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:03:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Melanie Dorson
melanie.dorson@gmail.com
4930 Fulton St. #204
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Catherine Starr
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:04:01 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Catherine Starr

Catherine Starr
cstarr2017@gmail.com
711 Elizabeth St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Kristin Gifford
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:04:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kristin Gifford
kristingifford@gmail.com
434 8th ave apt 1
San Francisco , California 94118

**From:** Jennifer Mayugba
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:05:00 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Mayugba
mugbug48@gmail.com
1278 Market St
San Francisco, California 94102-4801

**From:** Leah Hammond
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:05:19 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

So many of my colleagues, friends, and neighbors have been priced out of the city. For many people, rent controlled housing is the only reason they are able to stay in the city that has been their home for decades. Please protect rent controlled housing and the people who rely on it.

Sincerely,
Leah Hammond, District 10

Leah Hammond
leaheve@indra.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Elise Fischer-Colbrie
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:06:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Elise Fischer-Colbrie
elise.fischercolbrie@gmail.com
1260 broadway
San francisco, California 94109

**From:** Carolyn Link
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:08:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I write to you as a concerned San Francisco renter. Born and raised here, i always hoped to own a home but that is not possible and i can thankfully still afford to love here thanks to rent control. If the goal of upzoning is to make housing more affordable and more plentiful then existing tenants MUST be protected. Otherwise we risk displacing thousands of renters, only to end up with empty luxury apartments that existing renters can't afford, or worse, studio "tech dorms" without actually. Without strong protections for existing tenants, this easily becomes a handout to developers while making the affordability crisis worse.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve

out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Carolyn Link
link.carolyn@gmail.com
735 11th ave, #3
SF, California 94118

**From:** janice.bressler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Bressler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:12:39 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janice Bressler
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Heather Dalrymple
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:13:00 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Dalrymple
hcdalrymple55@gmail.com
2153 Sacramento St, #9
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** elizabeth morello
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:14:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

elizabeth morello
selizabethmorello@yahoo.com
green street
san francisco, California 94133

**From:** Christy Vong
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:14:25 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Christy Vong
vong.christy@gmail.com
268 25th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Lenaya Kimball
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:15:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lenaya Kimball

Lenaya Kimball
lpongan@yahoo.com
2053 Sutter St, Apt 101
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Robert Hall
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:15:47 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Robert Hall
bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** foxja24@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Fox
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:16:01 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This is not what our city needs- affordable housing is a critical unmet need.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Fox
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** Devra Edelman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:16:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Devra Edelman
devraimma1@gmail.com
200 Brannan St. #240
San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** Kathleen Tilt
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:17:01 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Tilt
kathleentilt@icloud.com
2261, Market Street # 145
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Mary Menees
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:19:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

Please protect tenants like me who have rent control and are over sixty. I've worked in non profits and for SF State my whole career never being able to buy a home. Please don't displace tenants like me. I've been here since 1985 and a tenant in my place for 35 years.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mary Menees

Mary Menees
marymenees@gmail.com
5132 Geary Blvd, APT 3
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** clarewafelbakker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Clare Wafelbaker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I live in the Outer Sunset district, I go to yoga in the Richmond area, eat out in the Marina frequently and have been a SF resident for the last 10 years. These plans will have a detrimental impact to the residents and small business owners that live and run their business in these iconic San Francisco neighborhoods. It is your responsibility to see that this does not happen. Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,
Clare Wafelbaker
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Heather Weeks Sampior
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Heather Weeks Sampior
40+ year S.F. Renter

Heather Weeks Sampior
hkweeks@gmail.com
2050 29th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** thanehale@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Nathaniel Hale

thanehale@gmail.com
819 Judah St
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Anne morse
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:21:53 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Anne morse
morsemedia@att.net
1462 union st
san Francisco , California 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | diannrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diann Rose |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 6:22:14 PM |

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transforms our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline so we have time to better understand the impact of the plan
- Host town halls in the affected areas to answer questions and inform the public
- Scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps if necessary to be sure the plan meets the city’s needs

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans potentially clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. We need to be certain that these decisions are not taken lightly and rushed through.

We need to be thorough. The City deserves this!

Sincerely,
Diann Rose
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** Nora Scally
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:23:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Nora Scally
norascally@gmail.com
2515 Clement St, 1
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** timinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Kirsch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:24:20 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Timothy Kirsch
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Krystal Mandel
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:25:59 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Krystal Mandel
pinonkrystal@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Gregg Zywicke
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:26:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Gregg Zywicke
chloethewonderdog@hotmail.com
478 Warren
Sean Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Helen Gilbert
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:32:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Helen

Helen Gilbert
hgmelon@gmail.com
1207 32nd Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

**From:** Austin Willacy
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:35:36 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The disenfranchisement needs to stop here, now.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Austin Willacy
akw@well.com
3240 King Street
Berkeley, California 94703-2448

**From:** salenaart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alessandra Valentini
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:36:38 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): don't sell your soul and the soul of the city to those corporate scums. Have the decency to slow down the taking over of humanity. AI will fall and the bubble burst. No need to run for the cliff too fast. Keep it human

Sincerely,
Alessandra Valentini
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** Sarah Mitrani
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:39:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sarah Mitrani
smmitrani@gmail.com
20 El Sereno Ct., San Francisco CA 94127
San Francisco, California 94127

**From:** Megan Schneider
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:42:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Megan Schneider
meganjoyschneider@gmail.com
4646 Geary Blvd, apt 2
san francisco, California 94118

**From:** Sirinada Chanthachaiwat
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:43:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sirinada Chanthachaiwat
sirinada1@outlook.co.th

Berkeley, California 94703

**From:** Karen Langland
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:48:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
Please stop turning our city into a playground for the rich !!!

Sincerely,
Karen Langland

Karen Langland
klangland@earthlink.net
243 4th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Tiffany Pfeiffer
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:50:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tiffany Pfeiffer
tiffany.pfeiffer@gmail.com
1650 47th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** leejohnj.lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:51:40 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Lee
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** mspunkie47@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Latishia Bess
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:52:06 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Latishia Bess
Emeryville, CA 94608

**From:** Elizabeth Loomis
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:52:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Please don’t ignore the needs of the common folk in San Francisco. We are what make this city so diverse and wonderful,

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Loomis

Elizabeth Loomis
iamapumpkin77@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Alexis Lecach
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:54:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Alexis Lecach
ajl.diamond@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Raymond Cachia
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:56:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
All Rent Controlled Housing Must Be Carved Out Of Mayor's Plan

Sincerely,

Raymond Cachia
rcachiao1@gmail.com
1711 Washington Street
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Gina Hall
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 6:56:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Gina Hall
ginahallg@gmail.com
584 Castro St Apt 325
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Edward Rittenhouse
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:02:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Ed Rittenhouse

Edward Rittenhouse
Epr928@gmail.com
1105 Bush Street, APT 106
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** K Harrar
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:08:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.

Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.

We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.

Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.

Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.

Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.

Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening

– the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
K Harrar

K Harrar
errigaleire@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Courtney Veraldi
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:09:53 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Courtney Veraldi
courtneyveraldi@gmail.com
776 bush street
San francisco, California 94108

**From:** swf1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steve Fukuda
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:11:14 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Steve Fukuda
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** Jennifer Locke
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:12:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Jennifer Locke

Jennifer Locke
jennifer.locke@sbcglobal.net
740 35TH AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94121

**From:** gford212@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Blackford
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:14:40 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greg Blackford
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Allegra Kelly
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:16:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. As a rent control family it is disgraceful that you are trying to displace us more.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Allegra Kelly

Allegra Kelly
allegradeva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Dale Riva
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:23:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Dale Riva
daleriva@gmail.com
1001 Franklin 13-A
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** bascomassociates@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of H Doris Su
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:27:39 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
H Doris Su
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** Stephanie Sherman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:36:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Stephanie Sherman
stephaniesherma@gmail.com
25 Sharon st
Sf, California 94114

**From:** Olivia VanDamme
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:44:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I have been a renter in San Francisco for 8 years in the Outer Sunset and I greatly appreciate my landlord's affordable pricing on our unit and the rent-control that does not allow for a drastic increase in my rent. As a non-profit worker working at small non-profits and in a local museum in Golden Gate Park. My wages at these non-profits would not be able to afford rising costs of rent happening now or for proposed new market rate units. As other friends who are non-profit workers, coaches, educators all pouring into the future generations education and out of school time activities, we deserve affordable housing.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve

out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Olivia VanDamme
oliviavandamme14@gmail.com
189 Country Club Dr
San Francisco, California 94132

**From:** Robin Dekkers
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:45:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Robin

Robin Dekkers
radekkers@gmail.com
144 Grattan St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Banafsheh Jalali
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:48:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Banafsheh Jalali
banafsheh.jalali@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Maleeha Iftekhar
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 7:50:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Rent control was the only reason my family could live in SF. We were bought out and have to leave in November; and I will never be able to live in the place I grew up again.

Sincerely,
Maleeha

Maleeha Iftekhar
maleehaiftekhar@bennington.edu
751 48th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** John Hronowski
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:04:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

John Hronowski
johnhronowski@mac.com
1539 Clay Street Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Amy Perrone
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:11:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The city is already unaffordable. I've seen the fabric of the city change as musicians, artists, teachers and members of our community have been pushed out because of tech. It's been so sad to see the change from 'anybody can live here in some part of the city' to good luck finding anywhere to live that's affordable. That's no longer the case.We need more affordable options and affecting rent controlled units is not going to help.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing

strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Amy (rent controlled apartment dweller)

Amy Perrone
amy_m_perrone@yahoo.com
2942 Franklin St
San Francisco , California 94123

**From:** Kamala Oldham
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:12:27 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Kamala Oldham
[Humble renter in Sunset & broke college student]

Kamala Oldham
kamalaoldham@gmail.com
3131 Quintara St
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Philippa Colborne
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:15:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Philippa Colborne
cal94111@gmail.com
405 Davis Court apt 407
San Francisco, Ca 94111

**From:** Jeannine Zenti
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:16:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse. I absolutely disapprove of destroying existing rent controlled housing to build new units. Despite the promises, these are never affordable. We must preserve older structures and update them as necessary. Get creative! Developer driven housing solutions are a disaster. This should be obvious by now.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Zenti

Jeannine Zenti
jzenti@hotmail.com
1319 Florida
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** Eckhart Beatty
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:16:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,
The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Eckhart Beatty

Eckhart Beatty
eckhart.c.beatty@gmail.com
110 6th Ave. San Francisco, CA 94118, Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** lorrainebustamante2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorraine Bustamante
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:29:13 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I am a native San Franciscan and I have seen the many changes to our city that have negatively impacted our communities.
Why don't you consider consulting our community residents and hear what we have to say—and give us an opportunity to speak not in the middle of the day when we're working; And not just one or two times give us a chance to survive this imposition. Please don't behave like Trump is behaving — where it's obvious he doesn't care about us regular hard-working people.  Please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Lorraine Bustamante
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** Mahara Espinoza
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:36:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mahara Espinoza
maharae@yahoo.com
2210 Stockton St
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** erikatargaryen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Tomlinson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:41:53 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a small business owner, Franciscan, and 4th generation Californian, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- DRASTICALLY scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a POSTPONEMENT of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Billionaire developers will never create homes for San Franciscans. I love this city and do not wish it to become another New York or LA. I want it to prosper, but not at the expense of its unique culture and undeniable beauty which are comprised of the multicultural and dynamic residents and striking land and architecture. Embrace what smaller cities like Boston have learned - build 4- story, 10-20 unit buildings with mixed size units, small businesses on the bottom floor, and a residential feel.

Sincerely,
Erika Tomlinson

**From:** Caroline Ayres
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:46:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Caroline Ayres
carolineayres6@gmail.com
87 Dolores Street , APT 105
San Francisco , California 94103

**From:** Darlene Roberts
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:50:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Darlene Roberts
drob3438@gmail.com
555 Pierce Street
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Ildiko Polony
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:01:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ildiko Polony
ildiko.polony@gamil.com
1322 4th ave apt 4
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Chris Moore
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:17:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Chris Moore

Chris Moore
we3sf@sbcglobal.net
1255 Taylor St, Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94108

**From:** Rozanna Dyan Garza
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:17:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Rozanna Dyan Garza
dyangarza60@gmail.com
855 Waller St. apt 5
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Mary Martin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:19:04 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mary Martin
foreleg.annular.7d@icloud.com
159 Hearst Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Elaine Walker
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:25:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,

Elaine Walker (born and raised and still living and renting and teaching and being a therapist to SF - still barely affording it here)

Elaine Walker
eeewalker@gmail.com
273 Filbert St
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** leon_goncharov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leonid Goncharov
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:30:13 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Leonid Goncharov
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Sheryl Leaf
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:37:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sheryl Leaf
leaflet7@yahoo.com
1395 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** nyeta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Charney
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:42:07 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Charney
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Tamila Wong
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:48:51 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

**From:** Mohua Ibrahim
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:12:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Mohua Ibrahim
tarot-warble-06@icloud.com
680 Mission Street, #27K
San Francisco, California 94105

**From:** toluene_gigabit.5l@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melinda Costello
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:19:23 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Melinda Costello
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Sam Khozindar
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:48:15 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sam Khozindar
samkhozindar@yahoo.com
2697mission street
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** jeanine.l.mahl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanine Laman Mahl
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:53:15 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS. Upzoning will result in more cars, congestion, & put unacceptable pressure on schools, emergency services, etc. Upzoning will change the character of the neighborhoods. I'm 81 years old and have lived in SF since I was a year old. I have seen it go from always being able to park in front of the house that a normal, working class family could afford to buy, to families being taxed out of their homes (my parents) and to a place where parking is getting harder and harder. It has become a place too expensive for working class families (And I don't mean tech folks) to rent let alone buy. The zoo, the Academy of Sciences, the deYoung, the Tea Garden, etc., were all free. Now they are out of reach for many families. Upzoning will make the affordability crisis worse. Stop trying to change the character of our single family neighborhoods! We don't need more people, cars, traffic, and competition for parking. STOP UPZONING.

Sincerely,
Jeanine Laman Mahl
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Oksana Clem
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:56:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Oksana Clem
oksanakc01@gmail.com
1275 Buchanan St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Geoffrey McNally
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:56:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

This is a personal issue for me. I've lived in a rent controlled apartment for the past 19 years. Without rent control I would have to leave my beloved city. Please support rent control!

Sincerely,
Geoffrey McNally

Geoffrey McNally
glmcnally@hotmail.com
1700 Broadway Apt 301
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Judith Stein
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:59:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I urge you to not destroy rent control in this beautiful city of ours. Plans for high-rises in the Richmond and other districts will destroy the neighborhood qualities of these areas. Working class people will be priced out of being able to live in the city. This will affect all the businesses in the city. I urge you to not destroy rent control.

Sincerely,

Judith Stein
judithastein@gmail.com
46 Arlington
San Francisco , California 94131

**From:** Laura Kerimova
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:59:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Laura Kerimova
laurasimone6@gmail.com
1275 Buchanan St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stephen Torres |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 5:55:49 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025.10.20%20Letter%20to%20Land%20Use%20&%20Transportation%20Re-%20Family%20Zoni.pdf |

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

Dear Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached my comments from today's hearing.

Thanks so much,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission-Bernal
San Francisco, California

October 20, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Before you is the disingenuously named *Family Zoning Plan.* The name is disingenuous because, as countless public testimonies and data have detailed, this plan does nothing to actually ensure housing for families. It does little but ensure that developers can now access thousands of residential and commercial parcels with almost no regulation and property owners can sell their property for several times its current value. It is also likely to make thousands of San Franciscans homeless, hundreds of small businesses close, and irrevocably change our city all without adequate funding or infrastructure in the face of serious challenges ranging from transportation to natural disasters to climate change.

Chairperson Melgar, Supervisors Chan, Chen and other supervisors have introduced amendments to mitigate the egregious impacts of this plan, such as the loss of rent controlled housing. I appreciate this work and encourage this committee to pursue those that which ensures that the total of all existing housing stock is protected from demolition, that small businesses are preserved, & that our neighbourhoods and city are preserved, even it requires sending this legislation back.

One recurring claim is that nothing can be done as our elected representatives in Sacramento are holding a gun to our heads with punitive measures and defunding as threats against San Franciscans. I caution against this messaging as it may signal unintended complicity and lack of fortitude. If our local leaders claim to be powerless to stop this kind of deregulation and removal of protections for the people of San Francisco, what can we expect as even more edicts imperiling San Franciscans are handed down from Sacramento or even Washington? To dismiss this, and imply that housing deregulation is hardly the same as the other ways in which San Francisco is being endangered , I would ask that our leaders consider what it is like to be evicted, to be an elder who will die on the street, to have a family business close and lose one's livelihood, or to be displaced from your generational community. The silencing and removal of our City's most vulnerable have historically come in many forms.

To imply that compliance with law, srate or otherwise, regardless of how it targets our most vulnerable sets a dangerous precedent. I implore us to use the same bravery and conviction we do when we decry other bullying and threats made toward San Francisco and apply it to the

legislative coercion being employed by leadership in Sacramento, people who purport to represent us just as you do.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

**From:** Elma Caplin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:59:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Elma Caplin
elmacaplin@gmail.com
101 Polk Street Apt 1111, San Francisco CA 94102
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** Laura Booth
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:00:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Laura Booth

Renter in the Richmond district

Laura Booth
laurasbooth@gmail.com
1900 Cabrillo St., Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Lauren Carara
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:00:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lauren Carara
lcarara@gmail.com
486 Funston Ave, Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Cassondra Curiel
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Amend Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Significantly - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:01:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cassondra Curiel
ccuriel@uesf.org
87 Grand View Ave.
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Lauren Mogannam
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:02:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lauren Mogannam
lmogannam@gmail.com
1535 Taraval St, 401
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Luz Mery Betancur Londoño
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:29 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Luz Mery Betancur Londoño
betancur1216@icloud.com
474 Natoma 6 street # 207
San Francisco cal , California 94103

**From:** melissa boyd
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Melissa Boyd

melissa boyd
girlwhocandoboth@gmail.com
1538 42nd avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Chagua Camacho-Olguín
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:03:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Chagua Camacho-Olguín
chaguis68@gmail.com
182 Granville Way
Sanfrancisco, California 94127

**From:** Stephen Albair
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:15 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Stephen Albair
stephenalbair@gmail.com
150 Page St. #47 Unit #47
San Francisco, California 94102-5837

**From:** mir49@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Miranda Claggette
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:24 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): My family has been living in San Francisco for five generations in the same house since the 1930s. I live on Dewey Boulevard and own another property on Connecticut. If this proposition passes, developers will be able to build an 80 foot high, four story building next-door to my home. As stated above, I am opposed to this plan as it will affect my family in unfavorable ways.

Sincerely,
Miranda Claggette
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Kirill Mogilev
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Subject: Amend or Reject Blanket Upzoning – Protect Renters and Real Affordability

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,

As the 150 Font Blvd Tenant Association, we represent renters living in one of San Francisco's largest multifamily communities. We are deeply concerned that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will worsen, not solve, the housing crisis by displacing existing renters and encouraging luxury development over affordable homes.

San Francisco's rental market is already at a breaking point — available homes for working people are nearly nonexistent. Without meaningful protections, upzoning will accelerate the loss of rent-controlled housing and push long-term tenants out of the city.

We urge you to adopt amendments that:
Exclude all rent-controlled homes from upzoning.
Require at least 50 % affordable housing on large opportunity parcels.
Raise inclusionary requirements to 20 % on-site BMR.
Protect small and legacy businesses from displacement.
Guarantee local prevailing wages for construction workers.

San Francisco cannot rely on speculative private markets to create affordability. The City must take leadership in protecting renters and ensuring that new housing serves those who already live and work here.

Sincerely,
150 Font Blvd Tenant Association
(With support from WSTA, TANC, and allied community partners)

Kirill Mogilev
kirill.mogilev@gmail.com
150 Font Blvd, 10-L
San Francisco, California 94132

**From:** Maggie Rummel
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maggie Rummel
Maggierummel@mac.com

San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** kelly.l.krause@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:04:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

kelly.l.krause@gmail.com
522 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Jamie Pearlstein
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:05:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I have rented in SF for about 15 years. I work, volunteer, and donate time and resources in SF. Please don't make me or other rent controlled residents lose our homes. Put yourself in our shoes.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jamie Pearlstein
jhpearlstein@hotmail.com
Diamond St #7
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** capozzialex@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:06:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

capozzialex@gmail.com
4150 Cesar Chavez , Apt 3
San Francisco , California 94131

**From:** Shanti Zinzi
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:07:56 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Shanti Zinzi
thenatureofthebeast@yahoo.com
Park st
Sf, California 94110

**From:** Erika Frick
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:15 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

As a 25-year resident of Nob Hill, I implore you to take action to stop the reckless building of housing that jeopardizes rent controlled tenants and fails to meet the needs of San Francisco citizens.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. Without significant amendments, it will make the crisis worse by displacing renters and small businesses and prioritizing luxury development over the affordable housing our communities actually need.

There is a better path forward. We can meet state housing requirements without displacing people and ensure that new housing is truly affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include the following priorities in any upzoning plan:

1. Protect all rent-controlled housing.
The proposal must explicitly carve out ALL of the city's 100,000 rent-controlled homes, which house over 200,000 residents. These homes are the backbone of San Francisco's affordability and must not be upzoned or put at risk. Our local Housing Element prioritizes preserving existing affordable housing, and that commitment must be upheld.

2. Require more affordable housing in all new development.
We must increase affordability requirements, not reduce them. Proposals to swap below-market-rate (BMR) units for market-rate ones should be rejected. Inclusionary zoning should be strengthened to require at least 20 percent affordable units on-site. On large opportunity parcels, at least 50 percent of new housing should be affordable, through the creation of an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

3. Phase in new development based on actual need.
New condos and market-rate housing should be introduced gradually, with regular review to ensure they match community needs. Large-scale construction of luxury units without affordability guarantees will only accelerate gentrification and displacement.

4. Protect small businesses.
Preserve San Francisco's certified Legacy Businesses and prohibit their demolition. Developers should be required to provide relocation assistance starting at $150,000, along with turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced small businesses.

5. Defend the public waterfront and other legacy areas
Public access and environmental protections must remain in place. Do not support efforts to privatize or develop our protected coastal waterfront.

6. Stop with the out of sync high rises
Do not approve height restrictions that will ruin our legacy neighborhoods from Nob Hill to Fisherman's Wharf to Telegraph Hill to Chinatown. There is no market for these expensive condos and no reason to ruin the beauty of our City.

Our neighborhoods and small businesses cannot afford more displacement. We need development that supports the people who already live here. I urge you to show bold leadership and protect the future of a diverse and affordable San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Erika Frick

Erika Frick
erika.awakening@gmail.com
845 California St., Apt 801
San Francisco, California 94108

**From:** Samia Afra
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samia Afra
samurai_10@hotmail.com
525 LEAVENWORTH ST, APT 21
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Carolyn Anderson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:08:50 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

If this were to happen, my husband and I would be evicted and would have to move out of SF. I would lose my community, neighbors and favorite place in the world. Please don’t let that happen.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Anderson

Carolyn Anderson
zomgitsbear@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** marcia pourfarrokh
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:09:10 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

marcia pourfarrokh
marci8054@gmail.com
357 4th Avenue
San Francisco , California 94118

**From:** Sandra Juri
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Sandra Juri (disabled and would be greatly affected by this change)

Sandra Juri
jurisa@sbcglobal.net
2210 Stockton St apt 4061
San Francisco, 94133

**From:** Stephanie Darling
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:41 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Stephanie Darling
irismoonchild0@gmail.com
1226 Grant Ave. #30
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** Brandi Valenza
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:10:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Brandi Valenza
brandi@thedevilsdesigns.com
167 Dolores Street, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** phnxextant2.0@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Owl
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:11:13 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Owl
San Francisco, CA 94102

**From:** spuleta71@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:12:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

spuleta71@gmail.com
2690 Great Hwy
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** Anja Bircher
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:17:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Anja Bircher
anjabircher@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Laura Carroll
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:17:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I’m totally sick of working class people, teachers etc being priced out.

Sincerely,

Laura Carroll
Lauramclouds@gmail.com
262 EVELYN WAY
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94127

**From:** Michelina Matarrese
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:18:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to ALL San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. The private market will NEVER do the job our local government should in ensuring San Francisco builds much-needed housing for all. We need your moral integrity and creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michelina Matarrese
rckstrgrl@me.com
1032 Steiner St
San Francisco , California 94115

**From:** Melanie Malinas
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:18:47 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for non-rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Melanie Malinas
melaniemalinas@gmail.com
4022 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94112-1017

**From:** Eileen Cronin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:19:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Eileen Cronin
ekcronin@earthlink.net
1950 Franklin St #10
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** DEMIAN QUESNEL
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:20:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Demian Quesnel
Longtime Castro resident [over 50 years].

DEMIAN QUESNEL
dquesnel@usa.net
4084 17Th St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94114-1944

**From:** Susan Mallon
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:21:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Susan Mallon
Long-time SF Renter!

Susan Mallon
sfmallon@gmail.com
909 PAGE ST APT 2
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

**From:** Loretta Chavac Ortiz
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:22:48 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Loretta Chavac Ortiz
lchavacortiz77@yahoo.com
821 Jackson St, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** David Perry
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:24:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

David Perry
perryd1@mac.com
1700 Octavia St. #301
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Michele Simmerer
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:24:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michele Simmerer
colorboxsalon@gmail.com
2777 Bryant Street SF CA 94110
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Michele Simmerer
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:25:02 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Michele Simmerer
colorboxsalon@gmail.com
2777 Bryant Street SF CA 94110
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Allison Sparkuhl
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Allison

Allison Sparkuhl
amsparkuhl@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** LeLeon Kizine
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

LeLeon Kizine
Kizinel@gmail.com
150 Berry St. #422
San francisco, California 94107

**From:** Joan Osato
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Joan Osato
joan.osato@gmail.com
743 grove street
San francisco, 994102

**From:** Taraneh Hemami
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Taraneh Hemami
taraneh.hemami@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** vanessabrown0316@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of V. Brown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:26:45 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

We live in the Inner richmond & there is not enough affordable housing nor infrastructure for residents as is. Do not sell us to the highest bidder! Counting on you to fight for us!!

Sincerely,
V. Brown
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** meganwithpapa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Megan Adams
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:27:28 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Megan Adams
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** chavetch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Hughes
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:28:43 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan,

I met you in a neighborhood meeting (Outer Richmond, 45th Avenue).

Please protect our neighborhood from this plan. If it goes through it will ruin it. Also, when the plan says it will add so many affordable units - it's like a joke. Affordable to whom? No person I know can pay for this "affordable" housing. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan Hughes
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** lroddan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lea Ann Roddan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:29:24 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lea Ann Roddan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Hannah Cardenas
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:29:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

With gratitude,
Hannah Cardenas, Western Addition resident

Hannah Cardenas
hannah.a.cardenas@gmail.com
1729 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Randa Talbott
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:30:49 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Randa Talbott
RANDATALBOTT@YAHOO.COM
3030 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Sophia Tarantino
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:33:20 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sophia Tarantino
sophialenschmidt@gmail.com
291 27th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Joann Ricci
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:34:18 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Joann Ricci
gravity_helmet_9f@icloud.com
1145 Church St
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** Pamela Uberti
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:35:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Pamela Uberti
pamelauberti@me.com
2290 Stockton Street, 2108
San Francisco, California 94133-1526

**From:** Rita Rodriguez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:35:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Rita Rodriguez
ritarodriguez5353@yahoo.com
118 San Jose Ave #A
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** adrian101x@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Adrian Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:36:58 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Adrian Truong
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** Ian Blei
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:37:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need, won't solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments.
There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ian Blei

Ian Blei
funk.metalman@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Angela M. Griffiths
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:37:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Angela M. Griffiths
ax3heart@icloud.com
600 Silliman street, Unit A
San Francisco, California 94134

**From:** Lani Asher
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:38:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lani Asher
laniasher8@gmail.com
1806 church st
San Francisco , California 94131

**From:** Lorena Lopez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:38:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lorena Lopez
lo_losart@yahoo.com
768 9th Ave, 16
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** dimaseg526@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dimas Gonzalez
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:39:57 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dimas Gonzalez
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** Terry Ayyad
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:40:20 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Terry Ayyad
tariq3699@gmail.com
159 23rd avenue 1
San Francisco , California 94121

**From:** Robert Rowntree
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** public comments - Family zoning plan
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:41:18 PM

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

i tried to sustain the line on monday , to give my comments. After in line 1 hour i had to go. My district 9 staff suggested corresponding w this "bos" address to submit my comment

robert rowntree  2889 24th St, San Francisco, CA 94110

On the zoning plan under consideration -

San Francisco is legally required to permit 82,000 new homes by 2031, and Mayor Lurie's "family zoning" plan—36,000 homes on the north and west sides—is a critical step forward. Without it, the state could take control of our housing approvals.

Up-zoning alone won't solve the problem. Construction costs need to stay in line with the rents tied to Area Median Income. AMI has grown about 4% a year, but construction costs in San Francisco have been rising at twice that rate - a mismatch jeopardizing affordable financially solvent projects over the longer term.

The contrast is stark: public projects like Potrero Block B or 730 Stanyan cost over $1.1 million per unit, while private projects such as 300 DeHaro deliver homes for under $400,000 per unit. High fees, long permitting timelines, and "everything-bagel" regulations are driving California home construction costs through the roof. A 2025 Rand study comparing costs among similar projects in CA, CO & TX focused on the reasons per sq. foot construction in CA is double or more the cost in Colorado and Texas.

Up-zoning and good finance must go hand in hand. That means cutting red tape, speeding approvals, reducing fees, and protecting small businesses and tenants as new housing comes online. If we can cut production costs even partway toward Texas levels, new CA rents could fall by 15%.

I urge you: approve the family zoning plan, weave in Melgar's eviction limitations,  pair it with cost containment, and give San Francisco the abundant, affordable housing we desperately need

**From:** 321dina@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:41:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

321dina@gmail.com
76 Deming St, Apt D
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Francis Broome
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:42:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Francis Broome
District 5

Francis Broome
Fjbinsf@gmail.com
615 Fillmore street
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Irma Arias-Greedy
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:42:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Irma

Irma Arias-Greedy
irmitarias@gmail.com
1361 Broadway
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** calihenson@earthlink.net
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:43:36 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

calihenson@earthlink.net
3300 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Katherine wells
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:45:48 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Katherine

Katherine wells
kathwwells@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Patty Cardona
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:48:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it continues to create an elist system that serves the ultra rich in this city. While dismantling and displacing the working class.

We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units.

Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. Stand with all social economic communities. Stop privatizing our access housing.

We need bold and common-sense leadership.

Sincerely,
Patty + Family

Patty Cardona
patty_cardona@mac.com
531 Silver Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Jenny Jerez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:49:43 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jenny Jerez
jenluv@gmail.com
391 Oak Street
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** stacy thompson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:50:54 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

stacy thompson
stacyt.thompson@gmail.com
120 webster #8
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Rhea Srivats
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:51:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Rhea

Rhea Srivats
rhea.srivats@gmail.com
801 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Beth Middleworth
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:52:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Beth Middleworth

Beth Middleworth
bats4bones@gmail.com
4115 , Lincoln Way #12
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Leslie Brand
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Leslie Brand

Leslie Brand
lbrand@me.com
2655 Polk Street, #201
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** lygia.stewart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lygia Stewart
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:08 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): don't destroy the great city you represent-
Try to remember WHY we all live here and LOVE San Francusc

Sincerely,
Lygia Stewart
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Brittany Newell
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Brittany Newell
ratty.writes@gmail.com
770 California St, Apt 504
San Francisco, California 94108

**From:** Paige Reillt
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:34:41 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Paige Reilly

Paige Reillt
1paigereilly@gmail.com
3090 Vicente Street
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** hue_khuu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hue Khuu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:06 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hue Khuu
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** dorit7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dorit Grunberger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:18 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dorit Grunberger

**From:** Camille Blomgren
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:35:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Camille Blomgren

Camille Blomgren
camilleblomgren@gmail.com
2047 Turk Blvd. Apt 3
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

**From:** Madelyn Moseley
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:36:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Madelyn Moseley

Madelyn Moseley
madelynmoseley@gmail.com
1454 Taylor St., Apt. 5
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** Diana Lacson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:37:36 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Diana Lacson
dianayak@icloud.con
2396 Pine Street
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:38:19 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please also create building standards which don't seem to be in the current plan. I'm most interested in understanding how the plan will ensure that there is consideration to the patterns and rhythms of our neighborhood will continue - stucco, shingles, craftsmen, Mediterranean, etc.

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** Jacqueline Ali Cordoba
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:38:22 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Ali Cordoba
jackiealicordoba@gmail.com
1585 Waller Street, Apt. 2
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Laurie Shanaman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Laurie Shanaman
lshanaman@yahoo.com
78 sycamore
San Francisco , California 94110

**From:** Ferdinando Penn
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:42 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ferdinando Penn
colors2dream@prodigy.net
1996 Chestnut St
San Francisco , California 94123

**From:** Karin Parks
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:39:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Karin Parks
ksp_designs@hotmail.com
737 Post Street
San Francisco , 9410@

**From:** Andie Sanchez
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:40:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Andie Sanchez

Andie Sanchez
andilyn111@yahoo.com
917 Cole Street
San Francisco , California 94117

**From:** Erin Gillespie
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:08 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Erin Gillespie

Erin Gillespie
gillesee@gmail.com
754 Fell St, A
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Berry Minott
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Berry Minott
b.minott@me.com

San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** Erin Nederbo
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:41:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Erin Nederbo
erinanederbo@gmail.com
669 29th Street
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Linda Blackaby
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:07 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Linda Blackaby
lindablacksby@me.com

San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Kathleen Smith
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Smith
ludasmith@icloud.com
1499 California street
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Wendi Raw
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I've been in San Francisco for many decades and we've seen this before. We've seen the problems that it creates and the lives that are broken. Our city has not gotten better over these decades because of this type of development. In fact, for those of us who have been here long, it has clearly made things worse. The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Wendi Raw
wendiraw@gmail.com
3460 16th St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Mary Bugarin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Mary Bugarin

Mary Bugarin
maria.bugarin7@gmail.com
1130 Filbert Street
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Erika Shershun
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Erika Shershun
erikashe@me.com
2028 Hyde St Apt 2
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Samantha Bellach
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:42:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Samantha Bellach

Samantha Bellach
sambellach@gmail.com
2332 15th St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** VICTOR Antonetti
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:09 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Victor

VICTOR Antonetti
cinch_steeple_55@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Karen Schanche
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever! We do not need more greed to be supported in Laurie's plan. Enough already! Think more creatively for the well being of the communities that make up SF, not just the

wealthy but those that are tenants that also contribute… it would be so much more powerful if we can support the collective in a shared common humanity, not just the wealthy few that are lucky enough to be owners.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Karen Schanche

Karen Schanche
karen.schanche2@ucsf.edu
614 Funston ave
SF, California 94118

**From:** Teresa Shelly
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Teresa

Teresa Shelly
tshelly@gmail.com
65 Sanchez St., Apt. 3
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Michelle Graney
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:43:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I am unemployed. Controlling my rent is all I have. Please do not do this.

Sincerely,
A girl who loves this city
Michelle Graney

Michelle Graney
michelle94109@gmail.com
480 Warren Dr Apt A
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94131

**From:** Walter Lenci
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:44:09 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

SincerelyWalter Lenci,

Walter Lenci
wlenci@gmail.com
1576 Clay Street
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** liz lawton
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:45:38 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

liz lawton
elizabethlawton98@gmail.com
654 castro st apt 1
san francisco , California 94114

**From:** tika hall
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Stop the evictions- Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:45:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Tika Hall

tika hall
tikaelhall@gmail.com
24 Kingston St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Maya Threadgill
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:28 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maya Threadgill
threadgillmaya@gmail.com
11 Dedman Court
San Francisco , California 94124

**From:** Christy Smith
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Christy Smith
theivyfox1@gmail.com
7630 Geary Blvd., Apt. 205
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** luigianni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Kraft
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:46:54 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrew Kraft
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Jennifer Rey
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Rey
jennifer.rey@me.com
336 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Theresa Schmitter
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Theresa Schmitter
theresaschmitter@hotmail.com
785 Brannan Street apt 508
San Francisco , CA 94103

**From:** Samantha Zylberman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Samantha Zylberman

Samantha Zylberman
szylberman@gmail.com
3130 Webster St, #2
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Cathy Asmus
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cathy Asmus
cathyasmus@gmail.com
1287 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Leonor Melara
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:27 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Leonor Melara
leonormelara@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Gina Sciarrillo
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:29 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Gina Sciarrillo

Gina Sciarrillo
pop_sickle_star@yahoo.com
545 Birch St
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** Gioia Everywhere
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Gioia

Gioia Everywhere
abieverywhere@gmail.com
1556 Great Highway, #204
San Francisco, California 94122-2858

**From:** Paul McCarthy
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:47:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I live in a one bedroom studio apartment in your district. I'm 75 years old. Under present San Francisco law I can stay in the apartment so long as I pay the rent. I don't want the city to ok tearing down my apartment building and replacing it with a luxury condo with huge rents.

Paul McCarthy
p_mccarthy@sbcglobal.net
2023 folsom #6
Oakland, California 94612

**From:** Jennifer Pacheco
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:08 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Pacheco
minajen@yahoo.com
3330 Cesar Chavez St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Tara Stroud
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:13 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tara Stroud
taraloo@hotmail.com
2744 Sacramento
Sf, California 94115

**From:** Beatrix Jones
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:38 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Our vibrant city suffers when we prioritize luxury apartments that end up sitting empty over truly affordable housing that enables residents from all walks of life to call San Francisco home.

Sincerely,
Beatrix, a resident of SF district 5

Beatrix Jones
beanotbeah@gmail.com
701 Fell St
San Francisco , California 94117

**From:** Remyah Nguyen
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Remyah Nguyen
r.liam.nguyen@gmail.com
2238 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Kelsey Moon
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:55 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kelsey Moon

Kelsey Moon
kcmoon4347@gmail.com

San Francisco , California 94121

**From:** Joanna Pablo
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:48:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Joanna Pablo
joannajpablo@gmail.com
3500 Market St, Apt 102
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Laura Martin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Laura Martin
a.martin.montero@gmail.com
3256 21st street
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Carla Naylor
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Carla Naylor
carla2naylor@gmail.com
11 Madrid Ct
Novato, California 94949

**From:** Lina Lucana
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:49:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lina Lucana
ample.87.volleys@icloud.com
750 bacon street
San Francisco, California 94134

**From:** Sara Brown
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sara Brown
bsara0896@gmail.com
3929 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Korri Piper
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:45 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Korri Piper

Korri Piper
korripiper@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** mojodugan@comcast.net
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:56 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Maureen Dugan RN
California Nurses Association

mojodugan@comcast.net
1454 10th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Kira Papineau
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:50:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kira Papineau
kirapap@yahoo.com
880 Franklin St
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** Amy Petrine
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:22 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

SF doesn't need more new market-rate buildings for housing. We need more affordable housing and programs to support our most vulnerable community members. Please remember the true spirit of San Francisco when you vote on this matter. All communities work better when we look out for everyone. Please stay strong for ALL your constituents, not just those who can afford to pour money into your special projects & re-election campaigns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Petrine
amy.k.petrine@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Kathryn Reffell
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:37 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. Do your jobs.

Sincerely,

Kathryn.

Kathryn Reffell
LadyActinium@protonmail.com
878 39th Ave, Fulton
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Emily Gifford
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:47 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco renter I am absolutely appalled by the mayor's plan to indiscriminately allow upzoning without protections for renters and small businesses or stronger carve outs for affordable housing. I know that the Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Emily Gifford
emily.elisabeth127@gmail.con
2515 Clement St. , APT 1
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** JOHN CERVANTES
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:57 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

JOHN CERVANTES
city10s@pacbell.net
532-28th Avenue , 4
San Francisco , California 94121

**From:** Lynette Betancur
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:51:58 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lynette Betancur
lynette.betancur@yahoo.com
67 Lapidge St
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Frishtah Afifi
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:01 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Frishtah Afifi
msybi@yahoo.com
78 Johnson Street Apt 518
San Francisco, California 94130

**From:** stephenzking@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen King
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:13 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):please do not implement this plan.

Sincerely,
Stephen King
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Billie Ferrell
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:14 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Billie Ferrell
bhferrell91@gmail.com
1650 Jones Street, Apt 115
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Yuka Kanpuri
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Yuka Kanpuri
Magicways7@yahoo.com
320 Turk
San Francisco , California 94102

**From:** winds129@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nelly Soncuya
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:52:54 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nelly Soncuya

**From:** Sarah Weidman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:25 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sarah Weidman
(sf resident for 20 years, full time student that could not afford to live in San Francisco without rent control).

Sarah Weidman
sarahrweidman@ail.com
1618 Polk Street 17
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Julie Dearborn
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:39 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Julie Dearborn

Julie Dearborn
juliedearborn@comcast.net
435 22nd Avenue, #3
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** Natalie Waugh
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:53:40 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Natalie Waugh
nataliewaugh@gmail.com
1564 Waller St.
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** Karen Khouri-Haddad
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Karen Khouri-Haddad
karehaddad@aol.com
1388 California St, #306A
san Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Bronwyn Galloway
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Bronwyn Galloway
bkg@awesf.com
601 OFarrell Street , 302
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Abby Van Kirk
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:54:35 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Abby Van Kirk
abbyvk2014@yahoo.com
633 , Grand View Ave
San Francisco , California 94114

**From:** Danielle Hoang
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:55:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Danielle Hoang
brokenpebblejewelry@gmail.com
129 bache street
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Sarah Mehl
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:55:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sarah Mehl
sarahb.mehl@gmail.com
3416 Taraval Street apt 3
San Francisco , California 94116

**From:** Ellie Vanderlip
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Thank you for taking this seriously.
Sincerely,
Ellie Vanderlip

Ellie Vanderlip
ellie.vanderlip@gmail.com
229 21st Avenue unit 5
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Moira DeNike
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:33 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Moira

Moira DeNike
moiradenike@yahoo.com
2 Mizpah St
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** priscilla@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Priscilla Marquis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:56:42 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Priscilla Marquis
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** Brenda Bryant
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:21 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Brenda Bryant
brenda-leigh@sbcglobal.net
895 34th Avenue , Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** Tania Campos
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:24 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tania Campos
tcampos10@yahoo.com
744 Goettingen Street
San Francisco, California 94134

**From:** Scarlett Bush
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:44 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Scarlett Bush
scraffyscarlett@gmail.com
3110 Clay St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Leah Kennedy
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:57:48 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
1- Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
2- Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should NOT be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
3- We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
4- Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
5- Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
5- Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Leah Kennedy

Leah Kennedy
leahelizabethk@gmail.com
844 Baker Street #2
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** Tricia Gillespie
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:12 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tricia Gillespie
Chesty.gillespie@gmail.com
227 Sanchez Street, 7
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** lananramadan@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

lananramadan@gmail.com
1111 pine st
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Catherine McGinty
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:58:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Catherine McGinty
catherinemcginty1@fmail.com
2516 Sacramento st
San Francisco , California 94115

**From:** okneprak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Karpenko
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:53 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please do not destroy the integrity of our single family homes in family focused neighborhoods. Consider height of dense housing not more than 40ft, parking and not displacing small businesses. There is already a trending of grocery stores being removed from neighborhoods. Geary Street  stiires in outer Richmond district are closing and are in accessible due to lack of parking. Taraval has a similar problem 19th ave to Sunset blvd.. San Francisco is a city and County, it is not fair to impose the same housing mandate that the state might impose on Sacramento/ Yolo County or Los Angeles. Scott Weiner who is the Architect of this plan is not trusted. Please consider more nuanced and reasonable dense housing solutions.

Sincerely,
Susan Karpenko
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** lindadellangelica@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Dell"Angelica
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:01 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Linda Dell'Angelica
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** foggydawg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrie Gigliotti
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terrie Gigliotti
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** djbabe3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Tam
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Tam

**From:** emilydlr50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emily De La Rosa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:56:38 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emily De La Rosa
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** emilydlr50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emily De La Rosa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:57:20 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Emily De La Rosa
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** momo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morris Shooer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:00 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morris Shooer
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Christina Rey
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:03 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Protect all diversity of all renters on this city benefits all districts.

Sincerely,
Christina Rey

Christina Rey
cvanonselen49@gmail.com
1926 Anza Street, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94119

**From:** johnkok@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kok
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:05 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Kok
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** mkiss52967@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Kiss
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:58:29 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margaret Kiss
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** LDawydiak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leanna Dawydiak
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:59:06 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Connie Chan, my supervisor;

As a native born and raised San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

This is pretty much a "canned" message but it displays my sentiments. I want you to know since this started I've been getting calls from people wanting to buy my house as it's on one of the corridors. I have no intention of selling and resent this which is only happening because of this upzoning crap!

Sincerely,
Leanna Dawydiak
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** lisaikeda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Ikeda
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:59:08 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lisa Ikeda
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** texeira@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lela Texeira
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:26 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lela Texeira
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** mustang77@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Cohen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:27 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrew Cohen
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** stacylgin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stacy Gin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:47 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Stacy Gin
Daly City, CA 94014

**From:** sbraa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sonia Sherard Braa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:54 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Why do state legislators have the right to change the liveability and character of entire neighborhoods? What about the desires of the current occupants of those neighborhoods who may not want to live in a dense, dark, concrete jungle? Why are the actual homeowners and residents disenfranchised of their right to say how their neighborhoods will be going forward? It's just wrong and it's unhealthy both for people and wildlife to increase density.

Sincerely,
Sonia Sherard Braa
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** waterwirt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wirt Lewis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:01:57 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Wirt Lewis
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** johnkok@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kok
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:02:15 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, (5th generation)I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

Bring back common sense & quit destroying our city.

Sincerely,
John Kok
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** k_kern@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Kern
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:29 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Additionally this plan decimates the character of the sunset. Furthermore why are we even entertaining this plan knowing we have a population decline not only in the usa but specifically San Francisco. It makes zero sense. The argument that if we don't do this the state will take it over is hyperbole. We the people should have the final say of what happens in our neighborhoods. Stop this political madness.

Sincerely,
Kevin Kern
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** tomchen99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Chen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:41 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Tom Chen

**From:** dfeifer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald Feifer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:03:42 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Donald Feifer

**From:** aliciaberberich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alicia Berberich
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:04:08 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We will lose the flavors of the neighborhoods and all that makes San Francisco so special. This is short sighted.

Sincerely,
Alicia Berberich
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** raggarwa_1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rahul Aggarwal
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:04:28 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Rahul Aggarwal
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** paula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Lynch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:05:27 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Paula Lynch
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** 5695ant@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Regala
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:06:51 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

SF is already unaffordable for so many people who make the city what it is.

Sincerely,
Anthony Regala

**From:** moorelevander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LeVander Brown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:06:53 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
LeVander Brown
San Francisco, CA 94103

**From:** zizivaga@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vivian Imperiale
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:07:20 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):The City should be proud to have several neighborhoods that were built as residential parks. They have such a history and such charm. Don't alter them and destroy part of S.F. history.

parks like Ingleside Terraces

Sincerely,
Vivian Imperiale
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** lg88sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lise Gutelius
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:07:51 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I grew up in the Sunset,  it's more than just a neighborhood to me, it's home. My parents still live in the home they bought decades ago there, and I've seen firsthand how much this community gives to the people who live in it. This upzoning plan isn't about housing people — it's about profit. Tearing down rent-controlled and affordable homes, displacing longtime residents and small businesses, and handing billions to developers without real investment in infrastructure, transit, schools, or services is not progress — it's destruction. We need thoughtful, community-led planning that protects what makes San Francisco livable and equitable — not luxury towers that push out working families and raise our taxes. Please do not sell out our neighborhoods.

Mayor Laurie is doing a great job in all aspects (for far too long we had a lazy useless mayor whose terms were a complete failure. It was disgusting to know she was an S.F. native), except this.

Sincerely,
Lise Gutelius
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** fpazouki@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fatemah Pazouki
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:08:55 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Fatemah Pazouki
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** thomas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Spielbauer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:09:20 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Thomas Spielbauer
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** lvngbdy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lucia Delgado
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:09:57 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lucia Delgado
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** alburdulis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Albert Birsulis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:10:35 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Albert Birsulis
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** soong.sharon@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Soong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:11:55 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We live on Gough at Vallejo. So many beautiful historic homes in this area. This Upzoning will destroy the fabric of this historic neighborhood and others like it. And when does a city become 'saturated'. When is enough, enough? We barely have the necessary infrastructure to support all the residents of SF now. How will it handle thousands more people?

Sincerely,
Sharon Soong
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:12:42 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

I am a senior citizen living in a rent-controlled apartment near Geary Blvd. I am terrified of losing it. Rent control is what has allowed me to stay in San Francisco. I am skeptical about MayorLurie's assurances that rent controlled buildings will not be demolished. When money is involved, politicians tend to forget about their promises.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** judywadesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Wade
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:12:55 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I fully  Mayor Lurie's plan, which will build much needed housing and allow San Francisco to grow to a size that will improve our tax base, support our small businesses, and allow our public schools to thrive as they will be at scale. All neighborhoods will have to sacrifice somewhat to ensure we create a thriving city. San Francisco shops and restaurants used to rely heavily on visitors from the East, North, and South Bay but these areas are now where the destination Shopping malls and economic growth are happening as these regions are of sufficient scale to have a Saks, Eataly and the like.
So let's build housing — affordable, middle income, 8-10 stories and duplexes. Otherwise we risk becoming a shrinking economic base and population.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We u

Sincerely,
Judy Wade
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** mjeshia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Eshia
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:15:35 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margaret Eshia
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** alaskadino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Thurston
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:19:18 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dennis Thurston
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** sherrill.foster@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherrill Foster
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:20:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I have lived in this beautiful city for 68 years (born and raised) and developers and billionaire investors need to do more to help with the homelessness problem for real not just to line their pockets and move on!

Maybe the problem is a billionaire mayor who sees the wrong kind of dollar signs for my city!

Sincerely,
Sherrill Foster
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** Terribel329@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Theresa Belcher
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:22:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San afranciscan, who lives in the sunset District, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Theresa Belcher
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** eobintalmadge010101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Talmadge
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:25:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robin Talmadge
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** beaubarlotte@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Charlotte Worcester
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:27:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Charlotte Worcester
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** gbirsinl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Birsinger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:28:18 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a second generation San Franciscan and I am very concerned about the impact of the proposed up zoning plan.

We are caving in to Sacramento to pass a plan which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The requirements for SF are based on outdated population/housing estimates. The affordable housing aspect is not a certainty.

There are tens of thousands units within the city which are in the pipeline for development, but they haven't been counted.  How about Candlestick? What's happening there?

Please reconsider. We will remember who represented the people and stood up against the unreasonable mandates from Sacramento.

Sincerely,
Laura Birsinger
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** charleer6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Charlee Moore
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:28:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Charlee Moore
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** sabaseifu93@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Saba Seifu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:12 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Saba Seifu
Schenectady, NY 12345

**From:** residue.wooden0h@icloud.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

residue.wooden0h@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** sagaris55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Short
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:30:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Laura Short
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** Kathryn Obertik
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kathryn Obertik
421 Cornwall St 4
SF CA 94118

Kathryn Obertik
supernova771@gmail.com
421 Cornwall St 4
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Jackie Martell
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Jackie Martell
jmartell095@gmail.com
1335 pacific ave
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** Krista Gustaveson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:31:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Krista Gustaveson
kristagustaveson@gmail.com
2460 Chestnut St, Apt 102
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Kelly Sullivan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:32:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Kelly Sullivan
msg_kelly@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Nicole Seguin-Morris
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Nicole Seguin-Morris
nicosemo@gmail.com
1605 Cabrillo at
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** dorit7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dorit Grunberger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 4:33:47 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dorit Grunberger

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:08:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:09:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** Regina Islas
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:12:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We DO CARE. There is no such thing as trickle down affordable housing, and it's well over time that we hit the bullseye directly. See below for instructions, and follow.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Regina Islas
regina.islas@gmail.com
105 Lake St, Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:28:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Vivienne Hay
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:02:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Vivienne Hay
vivienne.l.hay@gmail.com
1495 Golden Gate Avenue, Apt 207
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:27:39 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision. I feel this whole process is rushed and without adequate public comment and discussion. These zoning changes are the most complex and far reaching and many San Franciscans don't even know they are happening. We should be an example of democratic principals here in San Francisco and not cram things through as is being done at the federal level right now. We can do better. I have lived in San Francisco for 52 years in a number of different neighborhoods and I know that city planning can be done in an intelligent manner or we can go back to the mistakes of the "urban renewal" period of the 50's to early 70's when vibrant communities were destroyed in a discriminatory manner now judged to have been a mistake.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:28:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Any limitation of public comment can only be seen by voters as a deliberate attempt to stifle the opinion of residents and to push a decision down our throats.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:28:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Any limitation of public comment can only be seen by voters as a deliberate attempt to stifle the opinion of residents and to push a decision down our throats.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:39:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have lived in San Francisco for 52 years and feel that this whole process is being rushed so that is can be approved before the residents have a chance to know about it's full implications and have a democratic decision making process. The interests of the super wealthy are now what drives the federal government's priorities, I don't want to see that happen here in San Francisco. We can and must do better for the regular residents that call this city home.

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Scarlett Bush
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:43:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Scarlett Bush
scarlett.rachel14@gmail.com
3110 Clay Street, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** nlfederico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Federico
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 2:17:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nancy Federico
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** broazen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Roazen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:25:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bernard Roazen
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** sewbig1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of tracy weiss
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:42:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
tracy weiss
San Francisco, CA 94107

**From:** freyason@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Corbett
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
David Corbett
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Maykuwatani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of May Yanagi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
May Yanagi
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** amillerknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alyssa Miller
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:43:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alyssa Miller
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sophia.woodley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sophia Katherine Woodley-Von Rothschild |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966] |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 3:46:24 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sophia Katherine Woodley-Von Rothschild
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** bruceolitzky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bruce Olitzky
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I object to this planned legislation. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bruce Olitzky
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** mlogger50@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Logger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:33 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary Logger

**From:** jeski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mike andrewjeski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
mike andrewjeski
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** edmundsrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn Edmunds
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:47:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
As a native San Francisco, I love to travel to our distinct and beautiful neighborhoods and support small businesses in those neighborhoods. They create life, blood vitality community and offer the opportunity for small businesses to thrive and help families. To destroy this continues to destroy the fabric of San Francisco in the name of luxury homes That the average San Francisco cannot afford. I urge you with all my heart to keep the integrity and fiber of San Francisco live through small neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Roselyn Edmunds
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** mrd211@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Dryden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:48:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Dryden
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** hjrezvani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Huda Rezvani
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:48:14 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

we do not need more useless buildings in sf. please stop building unnecessary infrastructure and potentially causing a worsening housing crisis in sf

Sincerely,
Huda Rezvani
San Francisco, CA 94103

**From:** mleontyeva@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mariya Leontyeva
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mariya Leontyeva
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** rosenewton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Newton
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton

**From:** theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Harvey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:49:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): changing the height of buildings to six and eight stories along transit lines is too high. In addition maps showed a working lot on Taraval between 12th/Forest Side and Funston as allowing six story buildings up to 65'. No transit line is in this area.  That lot should be removed from proposal. At least.

Sincerely,
Sarah Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** wertheimlj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Wertheim
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:50:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I support additional and fair priced housing but I don't think the existing plan is a good way to go about it.

Sincerely,
Linda Wertheim
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** kwidoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phyllis Lim
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:50:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Phyllis Lim
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** dmshea@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debbie Shea Fox
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:51:12 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Debbie Shea Fox
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** sanlyg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sanly Guan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:54:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sanly Guan

**From:** halog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Constance Halog
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:54:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Redevelopment has never resulted in more affordable homes, it has gentrified and made unaffordable homes and properties in San Francisco and many other cities. We don't need more luxury condos, we need the neighbourhoods we have now. Stop corporations and developers from buying and destroying existing homes and businesses, and reduce/ eliminate AirBnB short term rentals.

Sincerely,
Constance Halog
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** czyarrow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Maher
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Linda Maher
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** guymbarbaro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Guy Barbaro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:55:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Guy Barbaro
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** Corey Smith
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:55:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Corey
California

**From:** Andrea Yeager
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:23:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, and a city employee I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Andrea Yeager
Children's Librarian

Andrea
California

**From:** Sherri Samu
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, September 21, 2025 5:50:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco tenant

Sherri
California

**From:** Jennifer Kroot
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:19:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

I'm a bay area native and an SF resident since 1989. I will do everything in my power to stop extreme upzoning. I voted for Lurie because I thought he cared about SF and wanted to try to solve affordability and homelessness. Instead it's the same Developer/Airbnb/billionaire priorities as with Breed.
STOP PRETENDING THAT UPZONING WILL HELP ANYONE EXCEPT THE DEVELOPERS AND THE POLITICIANS THAT THEY SUPPORT.

Sincerely, Jennifer Kroot

Jennifer

California

**From:** Robin Phillips
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 2:13:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robin Phillips
District 8

Oh, and let Scott Weiner know I'm not going to vote for him against Nancy Pelosi. I met him once in person and he couldn't make eye contact with me.

Robin
California

**From:** Cathy Asmus
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cathy
California

**From:** Carolyn Mitsi Hanrahan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 2:17:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please help us tenants! No displacement of any tenants!

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Carolyn MITSI Hanrahan

Carolyn Mitsi
California

**From:** Courtney Fedorchek
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:01:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Courtney

Courtney
California

**From:** Calder Lorenz
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:11:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Calder
California

**From:** Catherine Butler
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:28:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine Butler

Catherine
California

**From:** Lauren Kush
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:44:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lauren
California

**From:** Nikolas McConnie-Saad
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:55:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

The YIMBY/NIMBY characterization of development misrepresents opposition to development under one giant umbrella. It's a bad faith dichotomy cooked up by pro-development at any cost opportunists. San Francisco, like many cities in the USA has a shameful (racist, and classist) history of displacing marginalized and low-income communities under the saccharine guise of "neighborhood renewal/improvement." The Fillmore, SOMA, and Hayes Valley are just a few prime examples of culturally rich neighborhoods with long-standing vibrant communities that were uprooted and kicked out of the city, never to return.

Lurie's plan promises to do the same thing unless tenant protections are baked into the process. You think the homelessness crisis is bad now, just wait until all the aunties and uncles, grandparents, and young(ish) people in non-tech, non-corporate jobs are kicked out of their rent controlled units and are left to fend for themselves. Thinking that just building a bunch of housing will magically ease the housing situation in SF is akin to believing in trickle down economics. This logic sounds sort of plausible at face value, but it's the same load of crap that has led this country to have gilded age levels of wealth inequality.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-

one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including “warm shells”), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Nikolas
California

**From:** Frania Feldstein
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 4:17:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Frania
California

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lgpetty |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval. |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 4:56:03 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to

Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

**Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.**
**Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.**

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

**From:** Karen Grayson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:05:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Karen
California

**From:** Iris Biblowitz
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** All tenants need protection and real affordable housing that"s secure (not threatened with demolition
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:09:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, an elder, a retired nurse, a long-time renter, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Iris
California

**From:** Mart Deans
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:19:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

Please do not let this become another developer money grab like so many housing projects are. We have plenty of luxury and high end real estate in San Francisco. We need housing to support the vibrant communities of all incomes that make this city great.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Mart
California

**From:** Marquita Wills
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:28:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,Ms Wills

Marquita
California

**From:** Greg Cummings
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:41:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is big bank and billionaires trying to further reduce fair housing options and eliminate rent control.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Create a vacancy tax for unoccupied properties being held for investment purposes. Create a speculation tax for high dollar property flipping. Protect & strengthen rent control.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Greg Cummings
RICHMOND District

Greg
California

**From:** Lee Heller
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 6:05:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lee
California

**From:** Laurel Scotland-Stewart
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 6:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Laurel Scotland-Stewart

Laurel
California

**From:** Alice Polesky
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 7:00:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Alice
California

**From:** Anandi Worden
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:00:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

District 9 and I vote! Protect tenants rights, we are still here and we still vote

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Anandi
California

**From:** jgracelewis@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:54:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I will be devastated and forced to the streets if Laurie's upzoning proposal goes through.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Lewis

California

**From:** Farshid Fakhraei
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 10:33:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Farshid
California

**From:** Tiffany Konyen
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability! Make SF work for Workers!
**Date:** Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:06:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany
California

**From:** Neil Meerani
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:32:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Neil
California

**From:** mrothe@ccsf.edu
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:30:18 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Marianne Rothe

California

**From:** Sasha Gala
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:48:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan won't fix San Francisco's affordability crisis — it will accelerate displacement of renters and small businesses while incentivizing luxury development over homes our communities actually need.
The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods — tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates — urges you to support a better path forward.
As a constituent, I ask that any upzoning include:
• Build without displacement — Use creative financing and local union labor to build the already-approved housing pipeline while protecting existing residents.
• Landbank public and soft sites — Reserve them for workforce, senior, family, and community housing.
• Guarantee real affordability — Strengthen inclusionary requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom — including releasing voter-approved housing funds.
• Protect families — Require both minimum and maximum family-size units in "family zones" and eliminate permanent density giveaways.
• Protect small businesses and rent-controlled homes — No demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation at real cost ("warm shells"), and enforce the vacancy tax.
San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-led planning — not rushed deregulation that repeats past mistakes. Please work with us to deliver real housing for families, seniors, and workers.
Sincerely,
Sasha Gala

Sasha
California

**From:** Eleanor Cox
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:31:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

-Close the SB 330 loopholes:
+Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos)
+Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels
-Ask the City to identify an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance
-Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
-Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
-Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
-Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eleanor
California

**From:** Robyn Miles
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:17:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robyn
California

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Sam Woodworth |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Tanner, Rachael (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan Renderings |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:22:19 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I discovered that the renderings -- critical to illustrate my hearing comments on Monday -- did not come through. These are now below. I'm confident you'll agree the result is **horrifying**.

VALPARAISO


VALPARAISO


Fisherman's Wharf Today
Four Stories

Under Proposed "Family" Zoning Plan
6 & 8 Stories

Indeed, I consider the upzoning of the waterfront to be the most irresponsible -- even grotesque -- urban planning proposal of my lifetime. Worse even than building freeways into our downtowns and neighborhoods. It is simply unconscionable.

Justifying this action by reference to the State Density Bonus is a huge mistake. As you may be aware, there is a ballot initiative that will be in qualification over the next year to override all of Sacramento's appallingly undemocratic usurpations of local land use authority. Through incremental and little-noticed changes in state law, the fate of neighborhoods is now almost entirely in the hands of unaccountable bureaucrats far removed from the lives of the people most affected. Those laws can and I'm confident will be erased by the voters through direct democracy. In contrast, this legislation would be very hard to undo, and the most iconic part of San Francisco -- the single most visited and beloved part of the city, which not surprisingly features as your committee's own website backdrop -- would suffer severe and irreparable harm.

This up-zoning of the waterfront, if allowed to proceed, will remain infamous long into the future, and the rapidly expanding number of San Franciscans who know what is happening -- who *will* know what was stolen from the people of San Francisco for the greed of developers -- will never allow this to be forgotten. Do not let this be your legacy.

Sincerely,
Sam Woodworth

On Monday, October 20, 2025 at 09:36:26 AM PDT, Sam Woodworth <samuelwoodworth@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I'm writing to oppose moving the so-called Family Zoning Plan to the full Board. The plan fails to address the affordability crisis. Instead, it hands windfalls to wealthy property owners and turns San Francisco over to developers and speculators. Moreover, from canvasing neighborhoods, appears that less than 10% of residents are even aware of this plan – the most radical and permanent reshaping of San Francisco in its history. This plan will have serious negative effects on San Francisco neighborhoods and commercial streetscapes. Below I've also included renderings of some of the effects on our waterfront. But first I offer thoughts on why this plan is unwarranted and fails to meet its own putative objectives.

1. <u>A flawed premise</u>

The housing numbers driving this plan are based on fiction. According to the State Department of Finance, San Francisco's population is projected to grow by only 16,937 people by 2050. Yet the State's housing mandate requires the City to plan for 82,000 new

units by 2031—enough to house roughly 172,000 new residents.

That's a tenfold mismatch between reality and mandate. No credible economic model supports the idea that private developers will build housing far beyond market demand. The assumption that "supply alone" will bring down prices ignores the data: unaffordability is driven by wealth concentration, not zoning. The "Family" Zoning Plan is founded on the same trickle-down logic that has repeatedly failed in practice.

2. <u>This is not a plan</u>

What's before the public is not a planning document. Even Planning Commissioners have acknowledged that it lacks the essential components of a genuine plan: there's no implementation timeline or construction sequencing; no infrastructure, transportation, or open-space analysis; no comprehensive three-dimensional visualization or urban design framework (indeed the renderings from Planning Commission Staff are quite deceptive, mostly omitting the waterfront towers that the plan calls for – even from views clearly encompassing the relevant areas – while presenting a rosy and largely unchanged view).

This "plan" is a glorified spreadsheet, not a vision. The absence of physical or fiscal planning means this "plan" cannot claim to manage growth responsibly, especially in neighborhoods that already struggle with congestion, outdated utilities, and limited public space.

3. <u>The Inclusion of the Northeast Waterfront and Historic North Beach Commercial Districts Was Improper and Unjustified</u>

The decision to include District 3—and particularly the Northeast Waterfront—was made secretively this spring, without public process or prior technical study. Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, and North Beach were never identified as housing opportunity areas in any prior plan. Yet the new maps show widespread height and density increases across some of the City's most visited and historically sensitive areas.

The result is a massive, unvetted upzoning that invites speculative development with no assurance or even likelihood of affordability or infrastructure support. This is not responsible planning—it's a political maneuver that places irreversible pressure on the city's most visible and beloved waterfront.

4. <u>Overcapacity issues</u>

Even if one accepts the State's inflated targets, the City already meets and exceeds them. Under 2023 legislation signed by Mayor Breed, fourplexes and sixplexes are now permitted citywide, creating zoned capacity for roughly 400,000 new homes. Another 70,000 units are already entitled or under construction.

That's six times more than the state's assigned goal. Meanwhile, nearly 46,000 of the required 82,000 units must be affordable—at an estimated cost of $19 billion. The barrier to meeting that goal is financing, not zoning. The Family Zoning Plan does nothing to fund or deliver affordability.

5. <u>The waterfront wall</u>

The proposed upzoning of the Northeast Waterfront is one of the most unwarranted elements of the plan. At Fisherman's Wharf, height limits would rise to 65 feet across at least 11 blocks,

and to 85 feet—eight+ stories—on roughly 17 more. Along Columbus Avenue, height increases would extend for many blocks.

These changes would create a continuous wall of high-rises, three blocks deep and ten blocks wide, severing the city's defining visual and cultural connection to the Bay. Public vistas from the sloping streets of Telegraph and Russian Hills—views that have inspired painters, filmmakers, and millions of residents—would be erased.

Renderings below illustrate the scale of this damage. The claim that these height increases would be "barely visible" is simply a lie. The loss would be permanent and profound.

City officials have at times noted that the State Density Bonus law already allows 8-story buildings, and that this plan is meant as an "off-ramp" to design within City-imposed constraints. This is true in certain circumstances, but the density bonus law presents developers with considerable uncertainty and requires a series of special requirements, whereas the current plan simply puts the City's stamp of approval on walling off the waterfront.

6. Displacement

City staff often insist that rent-controlled buildings are protected and that demolitions are rare. Yet recent legislation has loosened demolition and redevelopment restrictions, and history consistently shows that upzoning accelerates speculation. Higher land values attract luxury developers, not affordable builders, leading to small business closures and tenant displacement.

To frame this community concern as "obstruction" is offensive. Residents are not opposing housing—they are defending the right to build responsibly, with equity and infrastructure in mind.

7. Manufactured "abundance"

Recent events surrounding the Mayor's Sept. 11 rally made clear that this plan lacks public legitimacy. The vast majority of attendees were there to protest, not celebrate. The reality is that the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" allows 75% of new units to be studios or one-bedrooms, while marketing itself as "family housing."

Calling that "family-friendly" is a branding exercise, not a policy. The rhetoric of "abundance" serves as cover for deregulation that benefits a narrow group of developers and investors, not San Franciscans in need of affordable homes.

Mayor Lurie is doing a great job in so many areas, as are you, the Board. We all know that this plan is essentially the handiwork of one person: Scott Wiener. Don't let his seeming nihilistic vendetta against the thriving neighborhoods of San Francisco destroy your legacy.

8. What real solutions look like

San Francisco already has models of what works. North Beach Place, a two-block, 341-unit, 100% affordable community serving families and seniors, is one such example. It integrates mixed incomes, local retail, and livability and enhances neighborhood character.

If the City truly wants to advance affordability, it should invest in projects like these—for example, replacing facilities such as the Pier 39 parking structure with mixed-use affordable housing, rather than upzoning historic neighborhoods for speculative towers.

9. We need leadership

This plan passed the Planning Commission on a 4–3 vote, carried only by the Mayor's recent appointees. That narrow margin speaks volumes about the plan's quality and legitimacy.

The Family Zoning Plan is not a strategy for affordability; it is a developer-driven land giveaway that undermines democratic oversight and jeopardizes the character of San Francisco's most iconic neighborhoods.

**I respectfully urge you to:**

A. Reject the plan in its current form;

B. Remove Fisherman's Wharf and Columbus Avenue from the upzoning map; and
C. Commit to a genuine housing strategy focused on affordability, infrastructure, and environmental integrity.

San Francisco deserves a plan grounded in real data and public trust—not another political slogan masquerading as policy.

Thank you,

Sam Woodworth

**From:** Sam Woodworth
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** Opposition to Current Form of Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 1:32:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I'm writing to oppose moving the so-called Family Zoning Plan to the full Board. The plan fails to address the affordability crisis. Instead, it hands windfalls to wealthy property owners and turns San Francisco over to developers and speculators. Moreover, from canvasing neighborhoods, appears that less than 10% of residents are even aware of this plan – the most radical and permanent reshaping of San Francisco in its history. This plan will have serious negative effects on San Francisco neighborhoods and commercial streetscapes. Below I've also included renderings of some of the effects on our waterfront. But first I offer thoughts on why this plan is unwarranted and fails to meet its own putative objectives.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->A flawed premise

The housing numbers driving this plan are based on fiction. According to the State Department of Finance, San Francisco's population is projected to grow by only 16,937 people by 2050. Yet the State's housing mandate requires the City to plan for 82,000 new units by 2031—enough to house roughly 172,000 new residents.

That's a tenfold mismatch between reality and mandate. No credible economic model supports the idea that private developers will build housing far beyond market demand. The assumption that "supply alone" will bring down prices ignores the data: unaffordability is driven by wealth concentration, not zoning. The "Family" Zoning Plan is founded on the same trickle-down logic that has repeatedly failed in practice.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]--> This is not a plan

What's before the public is not a planning document. Even Planning Commissioners have acknowledged that it lacks the essential components of a genuine plan: there's no implementation timeline or construction sequencing; no infrastructure, transportation, or open-space analysis; no comprehensive three-dimensional visualization or urban design framework (indeed the renderings from Planning Commission Staff are quite deceptive, mostly omitting the waterfront towers that the plan calls for – even from views clearly encompassing the relevant areas – while presenting a rosy and largely unchanged view).

This "plan" is a glorified spreadsheet, not a vision. The absence of physical or fiscal planning means this "plan" cannot claim to manage growth responsibly, especially in neighborhoods that already struggle with congestion, outdated utilities, and limited public space.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->The Inclusion of the Northeast Waterfront and Historic North Beach Commercial Districts Was Improper and Unjustified

The decision to include District 3—and particularly the Northeast Waterfront—was made

secretively this spring, without public process or prior technical study. Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, and North Beach were never identified as housing opportunity areas in any prior plan. Yet the new maps show widespread height and density increases across some of the City's most visited and historically sensitive areas.

The result is a massive, unvetted upzoning that invites speculative development with no assurance or even likelihood of affordability or infrastructure support. This is not responsible planning—it's a political maneuver that places irreversible pressure on the city's most visible and beloved waterfront.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->Overcapacity issues

Even if one accepts the State's inflated targets, the City already meets and exceeds them. Under 2023 legislation signed by Mayor Breed, fourplexes and sixplexes are now permitted citywide, creating zoned capacity for roughly 400,000 new homes. Another 70,000 units are already entitled or under construction.

That's six times more than the state's assigned goal. Meanwhile, nearly 46,000 of the required 82,000 units must be affordable—at an estimated cost of $19 billion. The barrier to meeting that goal is financing, not zoning. The Family Zoning Plan does nothing to fund or deliver affordability.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->The waterfront wall

The proposed upzoning of the Northeast Waterfront is one of the most unwarranted elements of the plan. At Fisherman's Wharf, height limits would rise to 65 feet across at least 11 blocks, and to 85 feet—eight+ stories—on roughly 17 more. Along Columbus Avenue, height increases would extend for many blocks.

These changes would create a continuous wall of high-rises, three blocks deep and ten blocks wide, severing the city's defining visual and cultural connection to the Bay. Public vistas from the sloping streets of Telegraph and Russian Hills—views that have inspired painters, filmmakers, and millions of residents—would be erased.

Renderings below illustrate the scale of this damage. The claim that these height increases would be "barely visible" is simply a lie. The loss would be permanent and profound.

City officials have at times noted that the State Density Bonus law already allows 8-story buildings, and that this plan is meant as an "off-ramp" to design within City-imposed constraints. This is true in certain circumstances, but the density bonus law presents developers with considerable uncertainty and requires a series of special requirements, whereas the current plan simply puts the City's stamp of approval on walling off the waterfront.





<!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->Displacement

City staff often insist that rent-controlled buildings are protected and that demolitions are rare. Yet recent legislation has loosened demolition and redevelopment restrictions, and history consistently shows that upzoning accelerates speculation. Higher land values attract luxury developers, not affordable builders, leading to small business closures and tenant displacement.

To frame this community concern as "obstruction" is offensive. Residents are not opposing housing—they are defending the right to build responsibly, with equity and infrastructure in mind.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->7. <!--[endif]-->Manufactured "abundance"

Recent events surrounding the Mayor's Sept. 11 rally made clear that this plan lacks public legitimacy. The vast majority of attendees were there to protest, not celebrate. The reality is that the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" allows 75% of new units to be studios or one-bedrooms, while marketing itself as "family housing."

Calling that "family-friendly" is a branding exercise, not a policy. The rhetoric of "abundance" serves as cover for deregulation that benefits a narrow group of developers and investors, not San Franciscans in need of affordable homes.

Mayor Lurie is doing a great job in so many areas, as are you, the Board. We all know that this plan is essentially the handiwork of one person: Scott Wiener. Don't let his seeming nihilistic vendetta against the thriving neighborhoods of San Francisco destroy your legacy.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->8. <!--[endif]-->What real solutions look like

San Francisco already has models of what works. North Beach Place, a two-block, 341-unit, 100% affordable community serving families and seniors, is one such example. It integrates mixed incomes, local retail, and livability and enhances neighborhood character.

If the City truly wants to advance affordability, it should invest in projects like these—for example, replacing facilities such as the Pier 39 parking structure with mixed-use affordable housing, rather than upzoning historic neighborhoods for speculative towers.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->9. <!--[endif]-->We need leadership

This plan passed the Planning Commission on a 4–3 vote, carried only by the Mayor's recent appointees. That narrow margin speaks volumes about the plan's quality and legitimacy.

The Family Zoning Plan is not a strategy for affordability; it is a developer-driven land giveaway that undermines democratic oversight and jeopardizes the character of San Francisco's most iconic neighborhoods.

**I respectfully urge you to:**

<!--[if !supportLists]-->A. <!--[endif]-->Reject the plan in its current form;

B. Remove Fisherman's Wharf and Columbus Avenue from the upzoning map; and
C. Commit to a genuine housing strategy focused on affordability, infrastructure, and

environmental integrity.

San Francisco deserves a plan grounded in real data and public trust—not another political slogan masquerading as policy.

Thank you,

Sam Woodworth

**From:** John Crabtree
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT 10/20 LUTC hearing)-Don"t Upzone the Coastal Zone
**Date:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:13:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am submitting this as PUBLIC COMMENT for the four agenda items regarding the Family Upzoning Plan, to which I am expressing opposition because the Upzoning Plan makes the crucial error of upzoning in the Coastal Zone. There are many other issuess with this Upzoning Plan, however, I believe that this is the worst and if it is not addressed then no amount of winnowing at the edges will make this upzoning palletable.

Put the Coastal Zone before Upzoning... put infrastrucutre before density... put tenants before developers... put labor unions before developers... c'mon, put people before profits/developers/billionaires for a change... John Crabtree

# Don't Upzone the Coastal Zone

A lot of bad ideas in the SF Upzoning Plan, but this one is the worst IMO.

JOHN CRABTREE
OCT 21

---

I provided an abbreviated version of the following testimony (in-person) to the SF Board of Supervisors Land Use & Transportation Committee at the hearing on these matters on Monday, October 20th. I also provided it today as public comment before the DCCC by electronically submitting it there and I will attend the meeting on 10/22 and do my best to deliver these comments in person. Lastly, I am submitting the comments herewith to the BOS LUTC members and staff.

John Crabtree
1375 35th Ave
The Sunset
San Francisco CA
94122
563-581-2867

City and County of San Francisco

Board of Supervisors

Land Use and Transportation Committee

Re: LUTC 10/20/25 — Genera Plan Amendments – Family Zoning Plan -- Local Coastal Program Amendments – Family Zoning Plan

Position(s): OPPOSE

Supervisors,

My name is John Crabtree; I am a resident of District 4. I am here today to provide comments in opposition to the Family Zoning Plan provisions currently on your agenda – particularly regarding General Plan Amendments to the Western Shoreline Plan and Local Coastal Program Amendments to the Zoning Map and legislation established in the Family Zoning Plan.

Much ado has been made in the media and the debate around the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" — points and counterpoints about whether, or not, the Upzoning Plan will turn the Western Shoreline Coastal Zone into "Miami Beach."

Unfortunately, that debate has become little more than accusation and denial. But there are issues here that cannot be denied. There are General Plan amendments to the Western Shoreline Plan and amendments to create a new Local Coastal Program in the Family Zoning Plan that is being considered here today for submission to the California Coastal Commission.

Whether or not you believe any of these matters have anything to do with turning the Western Shoreline into Miami Beach or Waikiki Beach, it simply cannot be denied that the Family Zoning Plan ***intent*** is to bring upzoning into the Coastal Zone, to create a local coastal zoning program to enhance development in the coastal zone, to create a precedent for upzoning in the coastal zone and create opportunities to develop and increase upzoning in the coastal zone in the future.

The California Coastal Act – was established in 1976 and will turn 50 next year, in 2026. The Coastal Act has, for very nearly half a century, served as a comprehensive policy framework that safeguards California's coastline. The Coastal Act was, in 1976, as it is today a pivotal policy commitment to stewardship of the coast. The Act itself states that the coast is, "a distinct and valuable resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people" and that it must be preserved for future generations.

Fortunately, the existence of the Coastal Zone and Coastal Commission jurisdiction delineates all of the embedded changes within the Family Zoning Plan with a bright line. General Plan changes (e.g. Western Shoreline Plan amendments), Zoning Map changes and the creation of a new Local Coastal (zoning) Program must all be submitted to and approved by the Coastal Commission. I urge you to oppose all such amendments embedded within the Family Zoning Plan.

There is no compelling argument to alter the Western Shoreline Plan nor to upzone in the Coastal Zone. Senator Wiener, at a recent meeting in The Sunset, said that the Coastal Zone needs to be diminished to allow for more development. But his arguments are decidedly NOT compelling.

Supervisors, there is a clear pathway to support the Coastal Zone and the Coastal Act, to defend the Western Shoreline and to preserve and protect, arguably, the greatest natural resource that we have here in San Francisco — Ocean Beach and the Coastal Zone and Western Shoreline.

I urge you to oppose all of the provisions embedded in the Family Zoning Plan that extend upzoning into the Coastal Zone.

Thank you.

Though the Heavens Fall... by John Crabtree is a reader-supported publication. To support my work, consider becoming a subscriber.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jesse Rawlins |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Public comment letter for Family Upzoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:42:50 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Outlook-tndc_logo_.png<br>TNDC Public Comment - Family Upzoning Plan.pdf |

---

Hi John,

I am hoping to submit a public comment letter as part of the official record for the Land Use and Transportation Committee's deliberations on the Family Upzoning Plan. I know the first committee meeting was yesterday, but by sending now, would that allow our letter to be for future committee meetings?

Best,

**Jesse Rawlins,** MSW, Policy and Administration Practice
**Policy Manager**
*email:* jrawlins@tndc.org
*mobile:* (415) 361-0967

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
210 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.tndc.org

*At TNDC, we believe that everyone deserves to thrive. We support tenants and community members in building transformative communities through Homes, Health, and Voice. Together, we can build a future with economic and racial equity. Join us at tndc.org!*

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

October 20, 2025

Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair
Supervisor Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood, Member
City of San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Amendment for Family Upzoning Plan and Future Considerations

Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood:

The Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) seeks to provide public comment for the Family Upzoning Plan and urges support for the Affordable Housing Special Use District (AHSUD) proposal and considerations for a future dedicated revenue stream and more equitable housing planning. These recommendations will help achieve affordability in the Family Upzoning Plan and progress local housing policy.

## Recommendation No. 1: Affordable Housing Special Use District (AHSUD)

The AHSUD proposal is one tool to better ensure affordability in housing as part of the Family Upzoning Plan. Quite simply, the affordable sector cannot compete with the private housing market with increased zoning. By supporting this amendment, prioritizing and reserving viable parcels of land will allow for affordable housing development to be competitive and possible. Without this provision, the plan's goal of benefitting San Franciscans that face affordability challenges will not be readily achieved.

## Recommendation No. 2: New, dedicated revenue stream

While developing a new revenue stream is outside of the Family Upzoning Plan, developing a long-term funding source in the future will be critical to support affordability through increased zoning and more. Previous measures have been piecemeal approaches focused on units in the development pipeline while a long-term, sustainable revenue stream should increase resources to address the larger affordability challenge. A recent National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) report identified a lack of 169,558 affordable homes locally, and new revenue should be developed to solve that problem and increase affordable housing overall.

Recommendation No. 3: Equitable housing planning

Planning future needs of housing mainly relies on economic factors including income levels. In San Francisco, the largest population increase is for those with the highest incomes, which is used to determine the need for housing. In doing so, a de-facto unaffordable housing system is created. In addition, housing planning does not consider displacement to determine need. Housing planning should not uniquely rely on population increases by income level but should aim to ensure housing allows for diverse income levels and account for displacement.

TNDC requests support to amend the Family Upzoning Plan to incorporate the AHSUD provision and requests future considerations for developing a new revenue stream and ensuring housing planning is equitable. Through these efforts, San Francisco can meet the local housing need that is affordable to all.

Thank you,

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | "Stephen Torres" |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png<br>2025.10.20%20Letter%20to%20Land%20Use%20&%20Transportation%20Re-%20Family%20Zoni.pdf |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 5:55 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** 2025.10.20 Letter Re: Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached my comments from today's hearing.

Thanks so much,

Stephen Torres

Stephen Torres
Mission-Bernal
San Francisco, California

October 20, 2025

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Before you is the disingenuously named *Family Zoning Plan.* The name is disingenuous because, as countless public testimonies and data have detailed, this plan does nothing to actually ensure housing for families. It does little but ensure that developers can now access thousands of residential and commercial parcels with almost no regulation and property owners can sell their property for several times its current value. It is also likely to make thousands of San Franciscans homeless, hundreds of small businesses close, and irrevocably change our city all without adequate funding or infrastructure in the face of serious challenges ranging from transportation to natural disasters to climate change.

Chairperson Melgar, Supervisors Chan, Chen and other supervisors have introduced amendments to mitigate the egregious impacts of this plan, such as the loss of rent controlled housing. I appreciate this work and encourage this committee to pursue those that which ensures that the total of all existing housing stock is protected from demolition, that small businesses are preserved, & that our neighbourhoods and city are preserved, even it requires sending this legislation back.

One recurring claim is that nothing can be done as our elected representatives in Sacramento are holding a gun to our heads with punitive measures and defunding as threats against San Franciscans. I caution against this messaging as it may signal unintended complicity and lack of fortitude. If our local leaders claim to be powerless to stop this kind of deregulation and removal of protections for the people of San Francisco, what can we expect as even more edicts imperiling San Franciscans are handed down from Sacramento or even Washington? To dismiss this, and imply that housing deregulation is hardly the same as the other ways in which San Francisco is being endangered , I would ask that our leaders consider what it is like to be evicted, to be an elder who will die on the street, to have a family business close and lose one's livelihood, or to be displaced from your generational community. The silencing and removal of our City's most vulnerable have historically come in many forms.

To imply that compliance with law, srate or otherwise, regardless of how it targets our most vulnerable sets a dangerous precedent. I implore us to use the same bravery and conviction we do when we decry other bullying and threats made toward San Francisco and apply it to the

legislative coercion being employed by leadership in Sacramento, people who purport to represent us just as you do.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
District 8 & 9 Worker
District 9 Resident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Joe Chmielewdki |
| **Cc:** | Marie; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Joe Chmielewdki <jcin506@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:04 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Joe Chmielewski <jcin506@yahoo.com>; Marie <marieamelie@sbcglobal.net>
**Subject:** Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To: Clerk John Carroll
Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Joseph Chmielewski
50 Golden Gate Ave, #506
SF, CA 94102
(mobile): 415.756-2913

Subject: Amend 250966 To Include REAL Tenant Protections

Good Afternoon,

I have lived and voted in San Francisco as a tenant for over 44 years and I am asking that you amend the Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" (250966) so it brings affordability and real tenant protections to the people of San Francisco:

• Amend the plan to remove all rent controlled parcels.
•Create a Tenant Protection Ordinance that protects all rent controlled housing citywide from demolition and "major alterations" by creating stricter Objective Criteria.

**Close the SB 330 loopholes:**
•Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos).
•Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels.
•Identity or create an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance.
•Show us a concrete plan for affordable housing and back it with ACTUAL FUNDING and expand rent control to new construction.

Mayor Lurie must stand up for our city against Scott Wiener's overreach. his hands are not tied, he can stand up to the State's overreach like many other cities in California have.

The Mayor must engage state representatives Haney, Stefani, Weiner to amend SB 330 to include protections for tenants of all incomes and a lookback period for tenant occupancy longer than 5 years. Stop hiding behind state laws while doing nothing to

change them!

Tell Matt Haney to Repeal Costa Hawkins, Reform the Ellis Act, and Amend the Housing Crisis Act to all protect rent controlled units which he never attempted to do.

Add amendments to the Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" so it brings affordability and real tenant protections to the people of San Francisco!

Thank you.

Regards,

Joseph Chmielewski

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Noah Garcia |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Family Zoning Plan public comment |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Noah Garcia <noahgarcia80@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 3:12 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Family Zoning Plan public comment

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Clerk Carroll,

Please find attached my public comments for the record on the Family Zoning Plan items before the Land Use and Transportation Committee today:

*To the members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment today. I'm Noah Garcia, I'm a renter in D5, and I respectfully urge a clean approval of a state-compliant Family Zoning Plan before you today.*

*I really enjoy living in San Francisco, and for that reason, I recognize that the city has to evolve and adapt to change. Average rent is now spiraling upwards over $3,300 a month, which is plainly unaffordable for so many residents that want to keep living here, let alone families that want to find a 2- or 3-bedroom home in the city.*

*The Family Zoning Plan lays the groundwork to create much needed homes that play to the city's strengths and alleviate the dearth of affordable housing here. By continuing to build near essential services and world-class amenities, we give San Franciscans more choices, not less. By building near some of the best transit systems in the country, we give San Franciscans more opportunities, not less. So let's do more to keep SF within reach for current and future residents by moving forward with a clean approval of the Family Zoning Plan – thank you.*

Noah Garcia

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Samantha Davis |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Land Use Question |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Samantha Davis <davissa.sf@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 2:20 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Land Use Question

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Question: Can anyone who has been part of this plan name a development in Hayes Valley or in the Mission that has led to a lower-priced housing effect in those areas? It seems by in large those well meaning new buildings never have the trickle down impact they are advertised to have and only lead to increased price in the housing stock.

*Samantha A. Davis*
*davissa.sf@gmail.com*
*415.269.5355*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Maggie Kuo |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Support for the Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Maggie Kuo <maggie.kuo761@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:57 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Support for the Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted

sources.

Hello Mr. Carroll and Supervisor Melgar,

I'm writing to express my support of the family zoning plan. It will go a long way to alleviate the housing affordability crisis we have in the city! My partner and I currently live in the Sunset, both make a six-figure salary, and yet, a median-priced home in San Francisco is out of our reach. We could buy one in Pleasant Hill, but we'd be looking at a two-hour commute each way during rush hour. We love living in the city and all the vibrant culture it has to offer, more than a life lived in cars for a house in the suburbs, so here we are! After reading the plan and attending the public comment session, I came away convinced that this plan was designed with utmost care to minimize the impact to all stakeholders involved, (not an easy task!) and will meaningfully increase the housing supply and help bring prices down.

Another benefit that most of the residents who are opposed haven't really thought about is -- the ability to keep their children and grandchildren in the city and give them property. Under the new zoning plan, they could build an additional unit in their backyards and have their family stay. I know that keeping family close by is an important value to Asian American families, an ethnic and cultural group that I belong to.

As for fears that the zoning plan will lead to Hong Kong style buildings, considering the average residential building in Hong Kong is 30 stories, I'm not worried. Because it's not realistic. What we're proposing is just the right height and density for the Sunset, and where they make sense -- along transit lines.

Another thing the city might want to consider to help open the housing stock even further - consider taxing overseas investors who buy up property and just let them sit empty! And use that money for tenant assistance who are affected by the relocation. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Maggie Kuo

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | "Prodan Statev" |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Support Mayor Lurie"s Family Zoning Plan for Families |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 21, 2025 12:08:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Prodan Statev <pstatev94@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 1:38 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Support Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan for Families

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee,

As a 41-year-old renter who has called San Francisco home for 17 years, I've witnessed firsthand the struggles that families face in our city. I currently live in a multi-generational household, caring for both my children and elderly family members. The housing crisis has pushed many families like mine to the brink, and I believe that Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan offers a glimmer of hope.

Opening single-family zones to duplexes, triplexes, and small apartments is a crucial step toward keeping working families in San Francisco. This plan not only promotes affordability but also embraces the diversity that makes our community vibrant.

And yet, the plan **doesn't go far enough**. I wished to see a more ambitious rezoning in the Western parts of the city, along with a significant and substantial permitting reform. I urge you to advocate for an amendment which will make building housing in San Francisco faster, cheaper and more predictable.

Let's work together to create an inclusive and equitable city where families can flourish.

Sincerely,
Prodan
District 1 Resident, 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Andy Katz |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Andy Katz |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Legislation Needs Much More Work To Be Acceptable |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 4:05:53 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

My name is Andy Katz and I am a lifetime native of North Beach. I am here to support our small scale village community and to oppose the developer and real estate speculator driven Lurie, Weiner, Sauter so called "family plan". This plan will cause great harm to our neighborhoods despite the various proposed amendments to date.

First of all, remove all of the rent-controlled buildings from the up zoning plan. The proposed amendment does not exempt all rent-controlled buildings as it should. This is vital to support workers and the elderly in our City and address their fear that they won't be able to stay in their homes. The plan does not focus on affordable housing but instead on market rate development which we need more of like a hole in the head. The required affordable housing percentages are too low. House our SF workers hanging on by their fingernails rather than building still more housing for the rich and investors. Many already built existing luxury units sit empty as we speak.

Preserve our history and protect our neighborhoods by forcing Mayor Lurie and the state to recognize the North Beach Historic District. Some of us have been working lovingly on these efforts for more than 20 years. Development should be created to scale in the neighborhoods it which it is placed with respect for our rich history, architectural context and our existing small businesses. Many of these are legacy businesses.

The production of this plan is forcing extremely complex and far ranging proposals and consequences through an expedited process which is the equivalent of putting a gun to everyone's collective head. Only developers and realtors win this way. San Franciscans must be heard and truly valued.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Andy Katz
andywkatz@gmail.com
SF, CA 94133

**From:** Robin Phillips
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 2:13:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robin Phillips
District 8

Oh, and let Scott Weiner know I'm not going to vote for him against Nancy Pelosi. I met him once in person and he couldn't make eye contact with me.

Robin
California

**From:** Cathy Asmus
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cathy
California

**From:** Carolyn Mitsi Hanrahan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 2:17:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please help us tenants! No displacement of any tenants!

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Carolyn MITSI Hanrahan

Carolyn Mitsi
California

**From:** Courtney Fedorchek
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:01:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Courtney

Courtney
California

**From:** Calder Lorenz
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:11:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Calder
California

**From:** Catherine Butler
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:28:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine Butler

Catherine
California

**From:** Lauren Kush
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:44:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lauren
California

**From:** Nikolas McConnie-Saad
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 3:55:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

The YIMBY/NIMBY characterization of development misrepresents opposition to development under one giant umbrella. It's a bad faith dichotomy cooked up by pro-development at any cost opportunists. San Francisco, like many cities in the USA has a shameful (racist, and classist) history of displacing marginalized and low-income communities under the saccharine guise of "neighborhood renewal/improvement." The Fillmore, SOMA, and Hayes Valley are just a few prime examples of culturally rich neighborhoods with long-standing vibrant communities that were uprooted and kicked out of the city, never to return.

Lurie's plan promises to do the same thing unless tenant protections are baked into the process. You think the homelessness crisis is bad now, just wait until all the aunties and uncles, grandparents, and young(ish) people in non-tech, non-corporate jobs are kicked out of their rent controlled units and are left to fend for themselves. Thinking that just building a bunch of housing will magically ease the housing situation in SF is akin to believing in trickle down economics. This logic sounds sort of plausible at face value, but it's the same load of crap that has led this country to have gilded age levels of wealth inequality.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-

one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including “warm shells”), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Nikolas
California

**From:** Frania Feldstein
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 4:17:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Frania
California

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lgpetty |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Subject:** | Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval. |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 4:56:03 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to

Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

**Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.**
**Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.**

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

**From:** Karen Grayson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:05:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Karen
California

**From:** Mart Deans
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:19:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

Please do not let this become another developer money grab like so many housing projects are. We have plenty of luxury and high end real estate in San Francisco. We need housing to support the vibrant communities of all incomes that make this city great.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Mart
California

**From:** Greg Cummings
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:41:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need. This is big bank and billionaires trying to further reduce fair housing options and eliminate rent control.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Create a vacancy tax for unoccupied properties being held for investment purposes. Create a speculation tax for high dollar property flipping. Protect & strengthen rent control.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Greg Cummings
RICHMOND District

Greg
California

**From:** Lee Heller
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 6:05:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lee
California

**From:** Laurel Scotland-Stewart
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 6:28:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Laurel Scotland-Stewart

Laurel
California

**From:** Alice Polesky
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 7:00:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Alice
California

**From:** Anandi Worden
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:00:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

District 9 and I vote! Protect tenants rights, we are still here and we still vote

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Anandi
California

**From:** jgracelewis@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:54:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I will be devastated and forced to the streets if Laurie's upzoning proposal goes through.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Lewis

California

**From:** Farshid Fakhraei
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 10:33:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Farshid
California

**From:** Tiffany Konyen
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability! Make SF work for Workers!
**Date:** Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:06:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany
California

**From:** Neil Meerani
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:32:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Neil
California

**From:** mrothe@ccsf.edu
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:30:18 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Marianne Rothe

California

**From:** Sasha Gala
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:48:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan won't fix San Francisco's affordability crisis — it will accelerate displacement of renters and small businesses while incentivizing luxury development over homes our communities actually need.
The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods — tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates — urges you to support a better path forward.
As a constituent, I ask that any upzoning include:
• Build without displacement — Use creative financing and local union labor to build the already-approved housing pipeline while protecting existing residents.
• Landbank public and soft sites — Reserve them for workforce, senior, family, and community housing.
• Guarantee real affordability — Strengthen inclusionary requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom — including releasing voter-approved housing funds.
• Protect families — Require both minimum and maximum family-size units in "family zones" and eliminate permanent density giveaways.
• Protect small businesses and rent-controlled homes — No demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation at real cost ("warm shells"), and enforce the vacancy tax.
San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-led planning — not rushed deregulation that repeats past mistakes. Please work with us to deliver real housing for families, seniors, and workers.
Sincerely,
Sasha Gala

Sasha
California

**From:** Eleanor Cox
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:31:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

-Close the SB 330 loopholes:
+Require 1:1 replacement of rental with rental units (not condos)
+Give all tenants a right to return at their existing rent regardless of their income levels
-Ask the City to identify an office tasked with overseeing and enforcing the tenant protection provisions coming from the new Tenant Protections Ordinance
-Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
-Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
-Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
-Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eleanor
California

**From:** Robyn Miles
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:17:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Robyn
California

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 12:10:50 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_966.pdf |

Hello,

Please disregard previous attachment. Correct 97 letters attached.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:07 PM
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Entezari, Mehran (BOS) <Mehran.Entezari@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** 97 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966

Hello,

Please see attached 40 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Christopher Pederson |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Support the Family Zoning Plan - Land Use & Transportation Committee Agenda Items 1-4 (Oct. 20, 2025) |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 8:19:49 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Letter to BoS Land Use Comm re Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attached is the comment letter of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in support of the Family Zoning Plan.
Sincerely,
Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

San Francisco
League of
Conservation
Voters

October 17, 2025

Re: Support the Family Zoning Plan, Agenda Items 1-4

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges the Land Use and Transportation Committee to recommend that the Board of Supervisors pass the proposed ordinances to implement Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco and California as a whole face a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from both the city and the state. The scarcity and high price of housing in coastal cities such as San Francisco, however, are forcing families to locate on the fringes of metropolitan areas where the automobile is the primary and, too often, the only viable mode of transportation.Those inland suburban and exurban areas have more extreme climates, encroach on threatened natural habitat and agricultural lands, and face high wildland fire hazards. To address the state's climate and housing crises, then, coastal cities and the state must promote much more multi-family housing located near major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts and in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.

By virtue of San Francisco's mild climate, its extensive public transit network, its concentration of major employment centers, its walkability, and its density, San Francisco is among the most environmentally appropriate locations in the entire state for new multi-family housing. On a per capita basis, San Franciscans drive less, use less energy and water, and occupy less land than other Californians. Providing more multifamily housing for people to live in San Francisco is therefore a crucial step for addressing the state's and city's climate and housing crises.

The Mayor's Family Zoning Plan, by allowing more multifamily housing along major transit lines and close to commercial districts does exactly this. Given that the city has previously rezoned much of the eastern half of the city to allow more multifamily housing, it is appropriate for the Family Zoning Plan to concentrate on western and northern neighborhoods that have provided little new multifamily housing in recent decades. Those northern and western

neighborhoods are also mostly higher resource neighborhoods where potential concerns about displacement and gentrification are minimal.

The SFLCV understands that upzoning can raise concerns about the displacement of small businesses and rent-controlled housing. The SFLCV supports addressing those concerns, but any such measures should not undercut the Family Zoning Plan's strategy of promoting significantly more multifamily housing close to major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

**From:** bridget.maley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Maley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 8:04:51 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

This is a series of confusing maps...not a plan. We need thoughtful urban planning that responds to the unique neighborhoods that make San Francisco vibrant. Further, issuing an Addendum to the EIR is not adequate environmental review under CEQA. A full EIR, recirculated for public review, is required for intervention of this magnitude in our city.

Sincerely,
Bridget Maley
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** lori.ottolini.geno@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Geno
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 8:11:06 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
Please zone smartly, insure accountability, understand the real needs facing the City and County of San Francisco, this requires the full Board of Supervisors and San Francisco residents to fully understand what the "Family Zoning Plan" would mean to the future of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Margaret Geno
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 8:32:15 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Thoughtful changes to zoning require not just mandates but also constituent support. Constituents want their city representatives to honor historic elements already recognized. Historic eligible buildings and neighborhoods should be celebrated and the proposed zoning changes must both protect them and encourage only new builds that are culturally and architecturally compatible with existing buildings in those neighborhoods. It's of vital importance that the Board of Supervisors recognize this and be willing to hear in public comment the views of all their constituents. Five generations if my family, beginning with my Sicilian immigrant grandparents, have lived in Ingleside Terraces. They have all valued and appreciated the street design, the architecture, and the historic context that created its layout. They want assurances that it will be preserved beyond the current zoning discussion so that future generations will see it, appreciate it, and maintain it.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** byobwcrew@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frog Gilmore
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 8:36:26 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please please please hold a Committee of The Whole hearing for this upzoning proposal.

Hey ya'll. Frog here. Yep, that's my name. You may have heard about an event I help with called Bring Your Own Big Wheel. That's not to brag but I'm proud to say I'm here to help keep SF creative, the city of possibilities that used to be for *all*. I've lived in SF for 26 sometimes nerve-wracking years. I say that because through these years I've been subject to an illegal owner eviction and I've watched friends and beloved artists pushed out of the city and bay area altogether through the waves of the dot com boom and bust and the current tech tide of startups and AI gold panning.

We must plan for responsible growth here, we must must must have protections for our renters and artists and non traditional earners in our city, we must keep the flavor in our beautiful Rice O Roni town.

What these upzoning plans DON'T have is clear protections for our most vulnerable renters, for our mom and pop business, and they don't have plans for infrastructure to support the increase in humans and their pets to certain areas. And why are we not discussing developing the empty spaces downtown in FiDi, that are already tall heights and near public transportation?

Thanks if you've read this far. I really want responsible growth in our city.

The formal wording is below:

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Frog Gilmore
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:25:51 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Do more to protect tenants and small businesses. ALL rent-controlled buildings should be safe from developers.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:32:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Jeff Kline
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
**Subject:** Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 9:46:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jeff Kline

Email kline.jb@gmail.com

**Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!**

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

**From:** georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 10:57:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
George Sery
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 11:59:07 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family & I have lived in North Beach for decades. We own a three-unit residential building. We support affordable housing. Upzoning is misguided--it will not create affordabel housing & it will destroy the character of SF neighborhoods. We should be making use of the existing buildings for affordable housing. I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 12:06:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Upzoning would be an irreversible disaster. Upzoning will not create affordable housing. Upzoning will destroy the cherished character of our San Francisco neighborhoods. Let's use existing buildings to create affordable housing.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for taking into account the views of the people who have lived in SF for decades.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** clivy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom McG
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 5:35:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Property tax payers should be able to have a say on changes in their neighborhoods.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Tom McG

**From:** mwais@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Wais
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 11:24:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: my wife and I live and have raised our son in an area that will be impacted significantly if this plan proceeds and urge the full committee to take part in considering the consequences of these changes for future families in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Michael Wais
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, October 18, 2025 10:10:15 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Do not give in to wealthy developers. Listen to the citizens of San Francisco before you act.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

San Francisco needs real low-income housing, not expensive buildings that have only a small portion set aside for affordable rents which are not really affordable to the majority of the workers in San Francisco.

Please not go blindly forward and ruin a beautiful city.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** kenvogg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Vokenski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Saturday, October 18, 2025 3:37:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SF is good the way it is, stop trying to ruin it. There are many different ways of virtue signaling that don't disrupt people's lives.

Sincerely,
Ken Vokenski
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** samuelwoodworth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Samuel Woodworth
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:50:37 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential, and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. In time in will make many beloved and iconic parts of the city almost unrecognizable, yet most of the public is just finding out about it or still doesn't know.

This drastic plan should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is totally unacceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote.

Sincerely,
Samuel Woodworth
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jscattini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JANICE SCATTINI
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:12:55 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
JANICE SCATTINI
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 11:23:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please protect San Francisco from speculative development that doesn't lower housing costs.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** mary.pickering@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mary pickering
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 12:24:03 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan. This policy will damage our city, destroying its uniqueness and making it less attractive to both residents and tourists. The unsheltered will never be able to afford living in North Beach or Pacific Heights. This is an excuse to enable developers to grow richer.

Sincerely,
mary pickering
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** amontuori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alfonso Montuori
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:19:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Embarcadero Freeway is widely considered the ugliest thing San Francisco ever built and a huge mistake. What is being planned today, essentially throwing out everything we learnt from that horror and from the Fontana Complex debacle, will be even more disastrous and promises to drastically change the way San Francisco looks. And remember, San Francisco is a city renowned for its beauty all over the world. Tourists come here from all over the world to be in and look at our beautiful city.

Do we really want to drastically change San Francisco? Of course not. Do we really believe this effort will provide affordable or family housing in any substantive way? Of course not. Do we believe other locations in the City with much more open land were skipped because they are not that appealing to the developers? Of course. Do we believe San Francisco's leadership is kowtowing to developers? Of course.

Furthermore, over the last months it's become apparent that the areas included in the “Family Zoning Plan” keep changing and growing, and nobody is willing to give citizens an idea of what this will actually look like and how it will impact neighborhoods. In other words, we are in the dark about what this will do to our neighborhoods, and given the way the leadership has communicated, and based on its actions, we can only imagine that it will be the worst case scenario.

Do you really want to be remembered as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors that sold our beautiful city to the developers?

I hope not.

Push back against developers. Push back against the State.

Insist on alternative scenarios!

San Francisco is a world-renowned city. Let's act like one and show some self-respect.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s “Family Zoning Plan”.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco’s history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Alfonso Montuori

San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** amontuori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alfonso Montuori
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:28:14 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Embarcadero Freeway is widely considered the ugliest thing San Francisco ever built and a huge mistake. What is being planned today, essentially throwing out everything we learnt from that horror and from the Fontana Complex debacle, will be even more disastrous and promises to drastically change the way San Francisco looks. And remember, San Francisco is a city renowned for its beauty all over the world. Tourists come here from all over the world to be in and look at our beautiful city.

Do we really want to drastically change San Francisco? Of course not. Do we really believe this effort will provide affordable or family housing in any substantive way? Of course not. Do we believe other locations in the City with much more open land were skipped because they are not that appealing to the developers? Of course. Do we believe San Francisco's leadership is kowtowing to developers? Of course.

Furthermore, over the last months it's become apparent that the areas included in the “Family Zoning Plan” keep changing and growing, and nobody is willing to give citizens an idea of what this will actually look like and how it will impact neighborhoods. In other words, we are in the dark about what this will do to our neighborhoods, and given the way the leadership has communicated, and based on its actions, we can only imagine that it will be the worst case scenario.

Do you really want to be remembered as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors that sold our beautiful city to the developers?

I hope not.

Push back against developers. Push back against the State.

Insist on alternative scenarios!

San Francisco is a world-renowned city. Let's act like one and show some self-respect.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Alfonso Montuori
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** tomacruz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Tomacruz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 3:52:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Frances Tomacruz
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:07:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is probably the most important vote you will take during your term of office. This will decide your legacy. Do you represent protecting and preserving San Francisco or do you represent the bulldozers that will show up if our City if not protected?

PLEASE hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:12:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, the destruction of the historic character of San Francisco, and transformation of our neighborhoods into cookie-cutter, unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- Protect Category A historic properties and our cultural heritage.

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** gmsunset@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Miller
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:12:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greg Miller
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** bklynbrn1826@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Bell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:18:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on Emerson St, a quiet dead-end street behind Public Storage. Building a 240 ft. housing unit at the end of this street will create a major headache not just for the residents, but small businesses such as Davita Dialysis Center, Sagebrook Assisted Living, and the American Terrazzo works that has been on Wood street for over 100 years.

Please, we, the residents of Emerson and Wood Street call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Contact me at my email address if you want to visit the neighborhood to discuss our concerns.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Bell
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** gek555sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gretchen Tallon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:54:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a citizen of the Outer Sunset, we are directly affected by the upzoning in both positive and negative manners.

The Westerly is a huge screw you to that neighborhood. The community fought this project and with good reason. There is NO retail in any of the space to date, it looks in disrepair and has yet to be full. The project at 3945 Judah is another screw you to us. According to the owner of the building, this project has been going on for 13 years! Its still a mess. Slowly nearing completion. Due to the nature of the construction there is no mechanical shaft allowing for a restaurant. And where the 2600 sq ft of shared open space will be located is anyone guess. This adds to the detractions of this upzoning project. It stinks.

A project seemingly successful is the Shirley Chisholm Village. This project met with the neighborhood, listened to the neighborhood and then created a project that both adds much needed housing for our teachers (I am a parent of a SFUSD student) and adds beauty to the neighborhood. They kept their promise to keep the essense of Playland with the shared opens pace, the building height does not overpower the neighbors and the buildings blend with our current architecture.

Additionally, in 2024 voters failed to pass Prop L to support MUNI. MUNI is in trouble, yet we are building like gangbusters near transit?

And truly who are we building for? This really will not reach the people they believe it will. If you read Bay Area Business Times, there is not growth truly happening here. I do not want to cater to AI after we allowed Google, Facebook, Salesforce, Twitter, etc to come here and fail to pay their fair share in taxes - where are these companies now?

Why don't you work with Park Merced? There is a huge amount of housing which is crumbling and because its private land, it can just sit there? What about the abysmal zoo? Close it, send the animals to zoo's who can actually care for them (its well documented, the issues with the SF Zoo) and build like crazy there. You have ocean front views, parking and very few neighbors.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Gretchen Tallon
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** don.ayers@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Ayers
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:19:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Governance is about people, not about numbers.

When I look at the continued expansion of Outside Lands, I hear politicians crowing the dollars that are supposedly flowing in, and not talking or thinking about how San Franciscans are now locked out of a public park, a public resource, for longer and longer times each year, and pounded with volume that would never be tolerated from a business or citizen.

Likewise, this issue is about the public quality of life that we have to chosen this city for. Those that benefit will be contractors and folks who already most likely have more money than they will ever need, and the quality of life here will deteriorate from this plan.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Don Ayers
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** kaurmona35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mona Kaur
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:14:48 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor and elected officials, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Mona Kaur
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:20:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:40:15 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane E Smalley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:41:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I love San Francisco. Please don't obliterate the beauty of the existing architecture and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Jane E Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** sjgorskilaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Gorski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:47:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

I have lived in D4 for over 45 years and an active community member who has voted in all local elections. D4 is not a place for the proposed upzoning. We urge you to allow full public comment at a Board of Supervisors' meeting to afford all residents to have full accountability.

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:55:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SON-SF - SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS SF
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:02:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
SON-SF - SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS SF
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** linda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of linda howell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:05:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history.

Additional comments:
I live in Jordan Park and right next to Clement Street--we would be greatly effected because we are between 2 transit corridors. These historic neighborhoods of San Francisco are the "soul " of our City and need to be protected. More affordable housing is needed but this plan does not do it properly. The Devil is in the Details and those haven't been worked out!

This upzoning proposal has been presented by the Mayor's office as the best of all possible alternatives for San Francisco. IF, in fact, he state will impose the state plan if we don't submit this before the January 2026 deadline, I understand it is in our best interest, Is there still  a possibility it can be revised either before or after the deadline? Most citizens were not aware of this proposal until way too late. It's a mess and all supervisors need to put their heads together on such an important issue for our CIty.

Sincerely,
linda howell
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:06:16 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a lifetime resident of the North Beach District and the proposed EXTREME upzoning is a real threat to my continuing to live here. In the last 10 years I have known renters (without fault) who have literately died from the stress of being forced to move from where they had lived for most of their lives. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This proposal will also remove the charm and livability for residents and tourists who support our small businesses that are a life line of San Francisco's economy So, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Mayor Lurie' is imposing permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Please:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Jason Wright
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:14:59 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in the Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

I've been in my rent controlled apartment for a long time, located on Church Street above Dolores Park in District 8. Although it's listed as being in a "transit corridor" on Church Street, it's located where the J Church MUNI cuts through the middle of the block (the right of way between 20th and 22nd Streets) and does not pass directly in front of my building. My building sold to a developer a year ago, and it's a 2-unit building, so I'm very concerned...even scared...of being vulnerable and losing my apartment. Even with some of the proposed amendments already, I think people like me (and my roommate) would fall through the cracks. If I lost my apartment, I'm afraid I'd be forced to move out of San Francisco. Please protect all rent-controlled units in these proposed zones.

Sincerely,
Jason Wright
Resident of District 8

Jason Wright
jasonkennethwright@gmail.com
851 Church Street
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** cdmccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey McCoy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:17:37 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Zoning laws are unique: If other laws prove undesirable, they can be removed without enduring impact on a community, but once a high-rise is installed among single-family homes, there's no undoing it. When Nordic countries need new housing, they build out new infrastructure and transit, and then build up in the new areas to whatever heights they need, so they're not betraying existing residents of established neighborhoods. If they can do things the right way, then we can do things the right way.

Sincerely,
Casey McCoy

**From:** asmeyer13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:18:50 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Please keep the 40 foot limit so all of us can continue to enjoy the vistas that make San Francisco beautiful! Our neighborhoods are the best all over the city.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** ccwrite1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Constantino
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:25:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

It is APPALLING and DISAPPOINTING that you are trying to ram this through like Donald Trump forces his will on the people. Shame on you! I will not vote for anyone who supports this unnecessary "plan." We need more AFFORDABLE housing, not more millionaires.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Carolyn Constantino
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:27:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** jeanbbarish@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jean Barish
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:28:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Jean Barish
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** pete@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Solvik
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:32:48 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

The upzoning will affect historic neighborhoods in San Francisco and is being moved forward without serious consideration of alternatives that would spread out lower height zoning increases more broadly along more transit corridors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Solvik
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** tinamcgovern3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina McGovern
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:33:00 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Christina McGovern
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:38:46 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live on Union Street close to Van Ness Ave. on the Russian Hill side. I am deeply disturbed by the proposed height, increases not only on Van Ness, but that go up along the adjacent blocks of Van Ness. These cross streets are currently almost entirely small residential with duplexes, triplexes and some six plexes. This is a significant and irreversible land use change without precedent. Hear your constituents please! There are other ways to address housing.

I have many concerns:
- The scale of buildings proposed will radically change neighborhoods that do not have the infrastructure to support them, cause the loss of existing businesses along Polk Street, add traffic and noise to residential neighborhoods already overwhelmed by diversion of traffic to streets like Union St during the bus lane on Van Ness construction period
- Van Ness is only just recovering from the multi years of construction of a median bus lane. This decimated many businesses. Additional construction on Van Ness, with multiple cement trucks and heavy cranes, will discourage people from frequenting Van Ness businesses and cause traffic fiascos and deterioration of the roadway
-Why is the no affordable housing included?
- Why not allow residential units on the ground floor of larger buildings which would increase the number of housing units? We do not need any more Pilates businesses.
- yes, developers want to build big, and get prime $ for multiple high floor units with Bay views. However, you are just catering to developers and taking away from your existing constituents by lowering the value of smaller buildings with existing views without compensation. You say “views do not count in land use squabbles” but you are forgetting the financial component which is a big + for developers and a big minus for others

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie’s plan. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Do not turn San Francisco into Miami.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** audreycrls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Carlson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:43:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I am very concerned that any plan will simply be overridden by our very own State Senator Weiner's legislation. We need a guarantee from Weiner that he won't overturn this.

Sincerely,
Audrey Carlson
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** knbnknk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Hori
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:45:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history.
I was born and raised in San Francisco, so I am disturbed and upset by these proposed changes to my neighborhood, my city.

It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Barbara Hori
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:46:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
I want to know why, if this is about AFFORDABLE HOUSING, the Upzoning Plan targets parcels that are currently RENT CONTROLLED BUILDINGS, (ie, Affordable Housing), for heights that double the current buildings' height, thereby incentivizing the demolition of rent-controlled housing. Rent controlled buildings must be zoned at their current height to remove this perverse incentive.

Second, this Upzone Plan offers the same old remedy for achieving more Affordable Housing - a fund that developers pay into in lieu of actuallyproviding Affordable units for sale or rent. Where is that money? How much money has been paid in? How much money has been spent, and where and how?

Third, does the Upzoning Plan plan for the maximum number of units that can be sustained in a drought?

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:47:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Other solutions exist that are not this drastic. San Francisco is currently a unique beautiful city. This will not longer be true if high rises
pop up in our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:49:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
In my neighborhood ( D8, Market Street and Noe) we have about 500 new units in several big new buildings. We have done our part for density increase already! Preservation keeps our city intact, beautiful and attractive.

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:49:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie & Supervisors:

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Living in D10 I have witnesses the major disuse & abuse of one district due to a lack of political pull & monied interests. We & the rest of the City don't need this real estate & building power grab by Mayor Lurie & Scott Weiner. It doesn't work & we need a more measured approach to our housing issues. This being said I am in no way advocating for less housing/building. I would ask that a more district by district approach with the burden being spread equally across the City.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52:09 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52:36 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:54:24 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It certainly should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors. All elected officials who are responsible for the loss of affordable housing should be on record so that we may vote them out.

Ergo, limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is NOT acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Your standing in this issue will be noted for the record as will any subsequent remuneration you receive.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** disp006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrence McKenna
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:55:51 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:I don't understand why developed neighborhoods are being targeted. At the foot of Geneva at Bayshore there is hundreds of acres of undeveloped land which would provide room for several new neighborhoods yet this area isn't even being discussed

Sincerely,
Terrence McKenna
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** erika.awakening@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Frick
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:56:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

As a 25-year resident of Nob Hill, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan," which I vehemently oppose. The stated reasons for these radical changes to our beautiful City do not hold water, as exemplified by the struggle 875 California St has had in selling even a limited number of condos since they blotted out views six and a half years ago!

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

- These condos will uglify our beautiful city for no reason!

- San Francisco's population growth does not justify this radical increase in housing.

- Very few affordable units are included. There is nobody to buy these mostly very expensive condos.

- As I understand it, the proposed housing is way beyond anything the state requires.

- All over social media, we see the real people of SF opposing this reckless building, yet Supervisors do not appear to be listening to the will of the People.

- Building should occur gradually with continuous reassessment of impact and actual needs. 875 California's difficulty selling units for YEARS already shows that our opposition years ago was well founded.

Please put a halt to this madness.

Sincerely,
Erika Frick
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** karenannbash@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:57:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Karen Bash

California

**From:** peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:01:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** schuttishtr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Georgia Schuttish
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:03:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear President Mandelman, Chair Melgar, Members of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lurie:

As a resident of San Francisco since 1979 and as someone who has attended every meeting on the Rezoning at the Planning Commission and the one on June 16th at the LUT, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This is a complicated piece of legislation that will determine the direction of San Francisco for the next 50 years.

Now there are going to be new amendments to the FZP.

The public needs to learn about these new amendments and be able to digest them and then comment on them.

Many people are just becoming aware of the Rezoning or have only become aware of the Rezoning in the past year.

Please schedule a Committee of the Whole Hearing prior to the Thanksgiving and all the end of the year holidays.

Thank you.

Georgia Schuttish

Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:04:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

We need community input and the chance to state our concerns to the full board before the vote. Preserve all the historical neighborhoods in SF

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jmhurabiell1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Hurabiell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:07:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Judi Hurabiell

**From:** kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:10:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:13:08 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** redpl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Lazear
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:15:01 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** benjamin.kuslits@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ben Kuslits
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:18:20 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

I have lived in the city for 12 years, and cherish the character and identity of its unique neighborhoods. The mayor's plan will irreparably damage neighborhoods, does little to remediate constituent concerns or demonstrate how the plan would actually create affordable housing, and will primarily benefit private developers.

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Ben Kuslits
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:18:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

We love our City and feel you do too. Listen to your constituents! Hear our voices and concerns!

In my humble opinion, Our Shared Vision of San Francisco's Future Development will in most instances result in a better outcome for all.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** glish.lauren@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Glish
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:19:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
Everything I have read about SB 79 and this new SF zoning plan has led me to conclude that the plan is irresponsible, would cause grave, irreversible harm to the city and is not what your residents, including myself, actually want.

Earlier this summer I sent an email expressing how devastated I would be to see this zoning plan go through. I've leased an apartment in the Marina district for over a decade — and the additional zoning plans along Lombard, Chestnut, Fillmore, and in Pacific Heights will permanently destroy the views and non-high rise charm of this beautiful area that I love. And the same holds true for almost all other neighborhoods impacted by the proposed zoning map.

All of the other San Francisco residents I have spoken to about this are in agreement that they would not want to stay in San Francisco either during the construction, or after the construction of all these new high-rise buildings.

As our elected officials, it is unacceptable to move this forward without all 11 supervisors hearing all public concerns. And I believe that failing to do this will cause many of Lurie's current supporters to turn against him.

Sincerely,
Lauren Glish
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** guybristow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Guy Bristow
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:19:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Guy Bristow
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** stevenaflamm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Flamm
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Steven Flamm
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kathygee606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Gee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** lbkerester@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laurie Berk
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:20:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

The existing proposed upzoning plan is flawed in many ways and feels like a developer's give-away. Views from the north toward the City will be negatively impacted with high rise buildings in the Marina, affecting the beauty of this City admired by residents and visitors alike. The north side of the City may not have seen the most recent density development, but it is one of the most densely populated parts of the City - it is just that building took place years ago. There are many high rises in Pacific Heights in particular, especially east of Fillmore along Vallejo, Broadway, Pacific, Jackson and more. More citizen input needs to considered before this proposed plan is approved.

Sincerely,
Laurie Berk
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** brainz_ca@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karin Hu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:21:34 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

I have lived in SF for decades. I plan to stay in SF forever and am alarmed at how new money, trendy Tech culture, and real estate development companies aim to change our neighborhoods from family homes to studios & small 1 BD apartments.

Families want homes with at least 2-3 BR bedrooms and yard space. Don't support the destruction of these homes in SF, making families move to suburbs and other cities.

I want to hold ALL Supervisors accountable for their vision of San Francisco and how they represent the goals of their constituents.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Karin Hu

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Sandra Monk |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors |
| **Subject:** | Please Amend the Mayor"s Redevelopment Plan-- It does nothing for housing affordabilty for so many San Franciscans. |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:30 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's "one size fits all" upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the basic housing construction we need throughout the city.

Here is a better plan, designed by real housing advocates
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.

Workers who provide CCSF services and build housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government.

We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sandra Monk
sandra.monk@ucsf.edu
2425 MISSION ST APT C
San Francisco, California 94110-2414

**From:** kathygrogan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Grogan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kathy Grogan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** dahlems@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Dahlem
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:23:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Please do not strip away our local voices.
The current plan has a lack of safeguards in our communities and is proceeding without public comment, thoughts, votes.
There are no guardrails for this, which may result in unintended consequences.
What makes SF so vibrant and wonderful is the ability to be seen and heard, and this current plan as it stands, is taking away that ability with one swoop.

Sincerely,
Monica Dahlem
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:24:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** ckutler2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Caroline Kutler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:25:40 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

My family and I live in Jordan Park and the lack of nuance and detail in this plan is astounding. We have two massive developments already approved in our neighborhood (the CPMC Hospital on California and 3333 California - BOTH by the Pardo Group). These developments together are slated to add nearly 1300 units to our neighborhood. That is a massive increase in a small historic community without any consideration of how that impacts local infrastructure. The current upzoning plans do not take these existing and APPROVED developments into consideration when allowing for massive height increases in development. This is a thoughtless and reckless plan that is being shoved down our throats without any consideration for impact on communities. I completely agree that we need to increase housing in SF but a one size fits all blanket approach is not the way to do it.

Sincerely,
Caroline Kutler
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** sharon_purewal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Purewal
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:26:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Sharon Purewal
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:27:38 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** madrider317@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Jordan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:28:05 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Jordan
North Hollywood, CA 91605

**From:** bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:28:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: Other solutions are possible to increase affordable housing. Solutions that do not destroy our neighborhoods.
I believe this can be accomplshed within the current 40 foot height limit in neighborhoods, with increased height buildings in the downtown area where buildings of these heights already exist.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Jacqueline Rios
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:29:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Rios SF tenant

Jacqueline
California

**From:** gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:30:26 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:30:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Isn't this a government that cares about its residents' voices? A model for the rest of the country on how to build smart, resilient cities that address actual needs because their residents are actively involved in shaping it?

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors. It should not steamroll others into implementation because a handful of people with power are willing it to be so. It needs to be nuanced and shaped by the people who call this place home and hope to for a very very long time.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable, nor wise. It doesn't help San Francisco continue to meet the needs of its people, it overrides their voices. Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Erica

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** elaine@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elaine Katzenberger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:31:37 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Elaine Katzenberger
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** ehirst1603@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eileen Hirst
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:31:38 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 50+ year resident of San Francisco and have lived on Russian Hill for more than 30 years. At the D3 Democratic Club meeting where Planning staff presented this plan, there was a fair amount of pushback. Planning staff sought to reassure the crowd by saying that almost none of this housing will ever be built, and that this is a 50-year plan.

In other words, this plan is not going to produce the workforce, family-appropriate housing needed right now. And, the Planning Department knows it.

Mayor Lurie, you are so proud of the 40-person SFPD recruitment class, but you can look forward to those new members leaving San Francisco as soon as they advance in ranks, couple up and start families. They will buy affordable houses on the edges of the Bay Area and put up with a punishing commute until they transfer to a public safety agency close to their home. Your plan expects them to wait until private developers build lots and lots of luxury housing, so many that all housing will go down in price. By that time, if it ever happens at all, that recruit class will be ready for retirement.

This plan needs to go back to Planning with a directive to identify parcels ripe for development, with no displacement of tenants or businesses. Then, the City should partner with developers to acquire financing and streamline permitting, and get housing built in time for that recruit class to move into it.

Supervisors, I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan". The entire Board needs to hear that there is a better way to meet the state mandate, one that will actually produce housing.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eileen Hirst
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** sm4art2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Suzanne Martin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:33:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: please protect all rent controlled apartments. Please do not demolish all rent controlled apartments. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Martin
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** maureen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Holt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:37:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

We live in D2, one of the districts that, at least in its historical intent, speaks to the uniqueness and quirkiness of what SF has always represented - to those of us who live here and those who choose to come visit here. This is why our neighborhoods are desired tourist destinations. People do not come to SF to see Manhattan sized buildings. People do not choose to live in SF for Manhattan height apartments. The entire premise of "needing" multi-tier high rises in traditional/historical family neighborhoods reeks of disingenuousness. Creating canyons of unnecessary high rises not only diminish light, one of the key variables which affect both quality of life and perceived happiness but also flies in the face of the purported objective of creating "affordable housing". A 16th floor apartment on Lombard with unadulterated views will NEVER be "affordable housing" - neither will a 2nd floor apartment in the same building. We all know that and it is insulting for communications to keep delivering that message. Meanwhile, we have plenty of unused space all over downtown that we are all supposed to believe cannot be adapted for housing, if that is indeed what we are after. Residents are seriously disappointed in the direction that BOS/Planning Dept/Committees are taking that show little respect for this city we all love.

Sincerely,
Maureen Holt
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** mmshea03@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Mullane
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:37:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We implore you to take this slowly and thoughtfully.

Do not rush into legislation that you can not reverse.

You represent the people of San Francisco so listen to us.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Think this through.

Sincerely,
Maureen Mullane
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Lazear
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:42:09 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

October 20, 2025

To: Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee
Re: Upzoning Plan - Oppose

I am Renee Lazear, a longtime/multi-generation resident of District 4 (D4) and Outer Parkside, a 5th generation Californian, a co-founder of SON-SF (Save Our Neighborhoods SF) and a member of NUSF. I am opposed to the current Map proposals for Upzoning for the multiple reasons that have been shared at several meeting and/or hearings that will ruin our Communities & Neighborhoods.

In D4, we have already begun to feel the consequences of these reckless plans.

Though not directly associated with Upzoning, the closure of Great Highway has increased traffic on our streets along with the associated risks and if this plan passes the traffic will only increase even more without another proper traffic management plan.

Those of us who are opposed to this upzoning plans have been called "NIMBY" and unaccepting of change by certain people, but my family has been in the same home for half this City's history. We've lived through significant change & not shied from it but learned to differentiate progress from dumping. We aren't about nothing in our back yards but: what is to be placed there, what purpose it serves, what benefit it brings for the costs it extorts, in short, we're reasonable.

There are many other options currently available to provide Housing, such as revitalizing Downtown and converting offices into residential, to name a few options.

This City's not the sum of its monuments but the layers fashioned by generations into neighborhoods and the working communities that are inseparable from them.

Modern history has many examples of someone else's idea of the future that lasted barely two decades but destroyed permanently, many functioning neighborhoods.

Upzoning as proposed is a reactionary political expediency, no different than the Urban Renewal that plowed working communities into towering failures. I ask that the current Upzoning Map proposal be rejected and that going forward a real effort is made to engage the local public in reasonable discussions for reasonable plans.

Thank you,
Renee Lazear, Co-founder
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** lareinatitania@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:49:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!
Most of us are not millionaires, cannot afford to buy new housing that is "affordable" and will

end up homeless and dead too soon if this continues as planned.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Marsha Henderson

lareinatitania@gmail.com
4304 18th St.
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Joe Chmielewski
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:50:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Joseph Chmielewski

Joe Chmielewski
jcin506@yahoo.com
50 Golden Gate Ave #506
San Francisco , California 94102

**From:** ribeiromarie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marie Ribeiro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:52:15 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Here in Glen Park we are ALREADY OVERLOADED as a transportation hub. Oursmall street infrastructure DOES NOT support 6 story housing in CENTRAL DOWNTOWN GLEN PARK . ( Chenery @ Diamond and Kern St specifically.)

Doing so puts PEDESTRIANS and BIKE RIDERS. ALREADY AT RISK into MORE DANGEROUS RISK.

OUR SMALL STREET INFRASTRUCTURE demands a more individualized look at each specific neighborhood into affordable housing projects. ONE SIZE FIT ALL DOES NOT SERVE ANYONE.

Trying to fix the mistakes of the past with the same kind of blanket /sweeping regulations WILL NOT WORK. WE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO PAY FOR THE MISTAKES OF THOSE IN CHARGE.

PLEASE VOTE AGAINST THIS

Sincerely,
Marie Ribeiro

**From:** carole.glosenger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of carole glosenger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:52:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: the upzoning plan is theworst idea for San Francisco. large apartment buildings in low height neighborhoods will be ugly and disruptive. If this plan goes through in the future people will say "who the hell let that happen" it looks like the "projects". They will say " That was Mayor Lurie".

Sincerely,
carole glosenger
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** Doug Woods
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:55:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Doug Woods
dwoods999@comcast.net
999 Fell St.
San Francisco, California 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | "Elizabeth Madrigal" |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: 10/20 San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee - MidPen Housing Letter in Support of Family Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | MidPen Housing Letter on Family Zoning Plan, Land Use Committee.pdf<br>image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Elizabeth Madrigal <elizabeth.madrigal@midpen-housing.org>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:52 AM

**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** 10/20 San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee - MidPen Housing Letter in Support of Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good morning,

Attached you will find MidPen's Housing's letter in support of the Family Zoning Plan, regarding item #2 at today's Land Use and Transportation committee meeting.

Please confirm receipt.

Best,

**Elizabeth Madrigal | Policy Manager**
**MidPen Housing Corp.**
275 Main Street, Suite 204, Watsonville, CA 95076
c. 831.240.8853
*She | Her | Hers*

MidPen HOUSING

Building Communities. Changing Lives.

**October 20, 2025**

Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Subject: Letter of Support for Family Zoning Plan**

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood,

MidPen Housing is pleased to write to you in support of the Family Zoning Plan. We appreciate the time and care that has gone into developing this rezoning program with the intent of it leading to the production of desperately needed multifamily affordable housing in all neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

MidPen Housing is one of the nation's leading nonprofit developers, owners, and managers of high-quality, affordable housing and onsite resident services. Since MidPen was founded in 1970, we have developed 139 communities and over 10,000 homes for low-income families, seniors and those with supportive housing needs throughout Northern California. In San Francisco, our team recently developed Shirley Chisholm Village which includes 135 affordable homes with a preference for SFUSD educators. Shirley Chisholm Village was the first 100% affordable housing development to break ground in the Sunset District in the last decade. Of the three affordable housing projects in the pipeline for District 2, two of them are developments of ours which will add 167 new affordable homes to the area.

The City and County of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) sets a goal of 82,069 new homes by 2031. Over half of these homes have a target of being affordable to residents making 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and below. In order to meet these goals, San Francisco must utilize all tools at its disposal to increase multifamily housing development and ensure that production benefits everyone across the income spectrum. Drawing from deep experience working with jurisdictions across the Bay Area on housing element policy, our team published a guide on best practices.

The Family Zoning Plan is an important step toward remedying historic patterns of segregation by dismantling hallmarks of exclusionary zoning and by allowing denser multifamily housing in northern and western neighborhoods. These well-resourced neighborhoods represent more than 50% of the city's total land but only 10% of all new housing built in the last 15 years. Our team is glad to be actively contributing towards building affordable housing in Housing Opportunity Areas to meet the city's mandate of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.

Thank you for your leadership and ongoing commitment to the production of affordable housing. Please feel free to contact Nevada V. Merriman, Vice President of Policy & Advocacy, with any questions at 650-477-6195 or nmerriman@midpen-housing.org.

Best Regards,

Nevada V. Merriman
Vice President of Policy and Advocacy

CC: Matthew O. Franklin, President and CEO, MidPen Housing
Elizabeth Madrigal, Policy Manager, MidPen Housing

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | George Wooding |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: 250966, 250700, 250701 |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Housing Alert v2.docx<br>image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Sunday, October 19, 2025 9:41 PM

**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; George Wooding <gswooding@gmail.com>
**Subject:** 250966, 250700, 250701

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 19, 2025

Dear Mr Carroll,

Please submit the attached letter, regarding the San Francisco Land Use October 20 Land Use Committee as written testimony.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

**Housing Alert**

**Notice of potential rezoning of height and or density in San Francisco. Please stop this bad zoning law by attending the September 11 Planning Commission meeting, testifying against this zoning proposal, and/or writing a letter.**

Why didn't the San Francisco Land Use and Transportation Committee's District seven (D7) Committee Chair, Myrna Melgar want to notify San Francisco residents of the massive rezoning changes to the planning code that would impact their neighborhoods? The Committee was counting on an uninformed public. Public ignorance is political bliss.

In opposition, Sup. Connie Chan (D1) introduced legislation that would require the Planning Department to send a notice by US mail to every residential or commercial tenant and every property owner within 300 feet of a proposed zoning change. Chan's legislation won at the Board of Supervisors on an eight to three vote. The three votes against the legislation were Myrna Melgar (D7), Bilal Mahmood(D11) and Matt Dorsey (D6).

Melgar said that the rezoning notification to the public is "not necessary." Why would Melgar be worried about 300,000 notifications? Well, maybe 200,000 residents might be concerned and another 50,000 residents might be angry. For the D7 supervisor who represents a moderate district with the most residential housing, Melgar is starting to act more like a YIMBY (Yes In My Back Yard) every day. It might be time for her to have lunch with Scott Wiener and Joel Engardio to discuss strategy.

"In the neighborhoods I represent, many have a lot of concerns and doubts about displacement," Chan said. "Not just tenants, but small businesses and aging homeowners, are worried they could fall victim to speculative real estate investors and be displaced."

Replacement of Demolished Units: For rent-controlled units in areas targeted for increased density and potential demolition under the plan, there are stipulations requiring that any demolished rent-controlled unit be replaced with another rent-controlled unit, and that the displaced tenants have the right to return to the new building.  Residents cannot afford to wait while their housing is torn down and rebuilt.

Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning" plan in San Francisco is a subject of intense debate, with concerns raised about its potential impact on existing tenants. While the plan aims to increase housing availability and affordability, opponents argue that it will lead to displacement.

Lurie's plan will only succeed in making developers rich, while diminishing the quality of life in San Francisco. Rent and housing prices will increase—not decrease because of the scarcity of land, less affordable housing will be built and fewer small businesses will remain open. There will be less affordable housing—not more.

In 48 Hills, August 3 article, titled "Small Business Commission rejects (for now) Lurie's upzoning plan" Calvin Welsh states, "This isn't an affordable housing program. This is a real-estate development plan, a plan for speculators. … Haight Street will see the displacement of roughly 50 percent of neighborhood businesses. There is nothing in this plan to preserve neighborhood serving retail.

Further, "If you want it in this plan, this commission [Planning Commission] must come up with the language. … You should amend the plan to require preservation of neighborhood businesses and neighborhood shopping districts." Calvin Welsh is right.

The upzoning plan is difficult to understand. So…this provides the simplest explanation of Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning plan. Developers and billionaires run San Francisco (Lurie is a billionaire). Billionaires and developers donate to local politicians and this gives them immense power over City Planning---ask former Planning Director Rich Hillis who stated on his May 3rd resignation letter, "I'm looking forward to taking some time off and thinking about what is next for me."

The Family Zoning plan was never about affordability. The Planning Department was ordered to create as much height and square footage as possible for developers. The plan was designed to demolish huge chunks of residential housing and Neighborhood Districts (NCDs). The demolision zones are permanent. Now that most of Planning's permit and CEQA and building guidelines have been removed or reduced, developers can do just about anything that they want to.

Developers can also get rid of affordable housing by paying an inclusionary housing fee or In Lieu fees to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). By paying these fees, Developers can now purchase the Planning Departments permission to build much more profitable Market-Rate structures. Developers will make a fortune as they carve-up San Francisco's NCDs and residential housing.

The Mayor's "Family Zoning Plan" should be renamed "The Developer's Demolition and Displacement of NCDs and Residential Neighborhoods" plan

**Over 50% of San Francisco's storefronts have already closed:** A San Francisco Chamber of Commerce study from August 2020 revealed that 54% of storefront businesses in San Francisco had closed due to COVID-19, with approximately 1,300 closures.

Data from the city planning department suggests that a significant number of small businesses in neighborhood commercial districts (NCDs) could face displacement under Mayor Lurie's plan to allow more housing density. Developers might be encouraged to demolish existing small buildings, which often house small businesses, to build larger residential structures. San Francisco's small business community may start to face extinction.

No small business can survive waiting for four years to have its location rebuilt. Some San Francisco Supervisors are discussing creating a small business relocation fund. Where will the business go and what will it cost to relocate. How much money would a developer be charged? Supervisor Myrna Melgar is trying to create legislation to develop this fund.0}

It's important to note that the Mayor's plans are multifaceted, and some aspects can potentially displace existing residents. Where will these residents go?

Under San Francisco's 2022 housing element and state law, the city must expand housing affordability and availability. This proposed citywide rezoning may increase the height and/or density limits of your neighborhood or others in your neighborhood.

The main purpose of this massive rezoning was to build more affordable housing. The only affordable housing that will be built will be subsidized by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). The MOHCD is broke. Developers will not want to build new affordable housing because it will not be profitable.

Under existing planning guidelines, developers can pay the city extra money (inclusionary housing fees and/or in lieu fees) to not build affordable housing. Thus, the city makes money on projects that do not abide by affordable housing guidelines, and developers sell residential units at market-rate prices.

Sadly, San Franciscans with an average median Income (AMI) of $150,000 or less could not afford to purchase any affordable housing without being subsidized. Yimby's members will still be living in their parent's basement.

**Delete44444/Dlete[The Family Zoning Plan is only partially about height and density; the real purpose is to create permanent demolition zones throughout San Francisco—especially on the Westside.** }

"This rezoning legislation is a key step toward meeting our state housing goals. We are laying the foundation for small and midsize housing projects in areas of the city where we have seen little housing production, allowing us to welcome new residents while supporting long-term tenants and small businesses," said **Sarah Dennis Philips, Director of San Francisco Planning Department**. "The mayor's Family Zoning plan effectively balances the preservation of our city's character with the necessary flexibility to ensure San Franciscans across all income levels can continue to call this great city home." Phillips was appointed by Lurie to be the new planning director in June.

Phillips statements regarding the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan is puffery The Family Zoning Plan is only partially about height ////density and affordability; the real purpose is to create permanent demolition zones throughout San Francisco—especially on the Westside.

DeleteThe Planning Department's demolition maps and guidelines will be designed to make as much money for developers as possible. These developers, in turn, will make contributions to local politicians.}

Ninety percent of the Planning Department's revenue comes from issuing permits.

The endgame is ////////"Density Decontrol" in San Francisco. Density Decontrol is a zoning policy being proposed in San Francisco that would remove unit limits on properties, allowing developers to build as many or as few residential units as possible within a building's height and space limitations. This proposal is a key part of San Francisco's efforts to address its housing crisis and meet state-mandated housing targets.

Residents should certainly be aware of Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, especially if they wish to save San Francisco's small businesses, residential housing, and special character of our neighborhoods, and be allowed to respond before the legislation becomes law.

If you love San Francisco, please don't support Mayor Lurie's housing plan. Neighborhood character will be destroyed as 40-foot-high housing will be allowed in residential mid-block streets and 55+ foot residential housing will be built on corner lots. NCD's will be built at 65', -140'+.

# Every homeowner and renter should attend these two meetings:

**-The** D4/D7 Town Hall on Sep 4th is to ensure west side residents are aware of what's happening with the rezoning, and energize them, ***after*** they receive the public notices (week of Aug 11) and ***ahead*** of the Sept 11 Planning Commission Vote & Sept 16 D4 Recall Election of Joel Engardio. There will be press coverage and potentially a live stream, to ensure reach.
**Location**: Irish Cultural Center (Thursday, Sept 4, 6 pm)

For questions or to request a meeting with the planning department on the family zoning plan email: sf.housing.choice@sfgov.org

**PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE:**

**Thursday, September 11, 2025**

**Place:**

**City Hall, 1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400, 12:00pm (noon)**

**CASE TYPE:**

**Planning Code and zoning map amendment**

**San Francisco Planning Commission**

**Project Name:**

**San Francisco zoning plan (Housing Element Rezoning program)**

**Case# 20021-00587CWP**

**QR Code Link: https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan**

**Board File Nos: 250700 and 25076**

**George Wooding**

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Quintin Mecke; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Segal, Ned (MYR); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Bonde, Aly (MYR); White, Ben (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | CCHO Letter, Affordability in Family Zoning Plan.pdf<br>image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Quintin Mecke <quintin@sfccho.org>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:24 AM

**To:** Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; White, Ben (MYR) <ben.white1@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) and our member agencies, we write to express deep concern that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, while well-intentioned, lacks a clear and realistic pathway to producing affordable housing in San Francisco.

Our coalition has decades of collective experience developing, financing, and building affordable housing across the city. Based on that experience, we think it's critical to provide a plausible pathway for achieving the affordability outcomes our city desperately needs.

We recognize the importance of submitting a zoning-compliant map to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that demonstrates theoretical capacity.

However, as currently drafted, the Family Zoning Plan offers no meaningful mechanism for actually delivering the affordable homes required to meet San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

The private market is simply not designed or fiscally equipped to produce deeply affordable units, and there are no provisions that enable affordable housing developers to acquire land, access financing, or build at the scale required.

## Affordability Is San Francisco's Defining Challenge

Affordability is the single most urgent issue facing San Franciscans today. Yet the Family Zoning Plan—like many initiatives before it—relies heavily on the private market to deliver affordability. This approach has failed. No scale of market-rate development will generate the deeply affordable housing needed, and inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) requirements or in-lieu fees, while important, produce only a fraction of the housing needed and cannot meet the deep affordability mandates set by the state.

In fact, 57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA—20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units—must serve low-income households. Market-rate development priced at $3,400 for a one-bedroom unit will not meet the needs of San Francisco's low-income families. More than half of family-household residents in the

city are low- or very low-income, including approximately 36% who earn less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

The adopted Housing Element offers a rare opportunity to create a bold, proactive citywide vision for affordable housing—one that the private market cannot and will not deliver. Affordable housing solutions must be implemented citywide and west-side rezoning should prioritize affordable housing, especially in areas that are vulnerable to displacement.

## Our Recommendations

To ensure the Family Zoning Plan becomes a meaningful tool for affordability—not simply a symbolic gesture to satisfy state requirements—we urge the following:

### 1. Amend the legislation to include an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

Establish a clear framework to incentivize and prioritize 100% affordable housing, including additional height, density, or streamlined approvals for nonprofit and community developers.

Mapping and reserving feasible parcels now will ensure that affordable housing remains a viable and competitive land use even as property values rise. Without targeted site identification, the benefits of upzoning will accrue primarily to private market developers, undermining the Plan's stated intent to support families and low-income residents.

### 2. Prioritize publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing.

Designate feasible public parcels—such as **Kirkland Yard**—for 100% affordable projects to ensure that upzoning results in equitable development, not speculative private gain.

### 3. Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure.

Pair zoning reforms with public investment. A voter-approved 2026 housing bond or equivalent funding measure is essential to unlock the 17,675 affordable units currently in the development pipeline. These projects are ready to build, but they cannot move forward without financing.

## A Call for Leadership

San Franciscans expect real solutions to the affordability crisis. We need a plan that reflects how housing actually gets built, not just where it could be built.

We urge your administration to work closely with us to deliver that plan—one that strengthens communities, stabilizes families, and keeps San Francisco a city for everyone.

We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to collaborate in refining the Family Zoning Plan so it truly delivers on its promise of affordability and equity.

Sincerely,

**The member agencies of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO):**

- 
- 
- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
- 
- 
- 
- Bill Sorro Housing Program
- 
- 
- 
- Chinatown Community Development Center
- 
- 
- 
- Episcopal Community Services
- 
- 
- 
- Homeownership SF
- 
- 
- 
- HomeRise
- 
- 
- 
- One Treasure Island
- 
- 
- 
- People Organized to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
- 
- 
-

- Progress Foundation
-
-
-
- San Francisco Community Land Trust
-
-
-
- San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
-
-
-
- Self-Help for the Elderly
-
-
-
- Senior and Disability Action
-
-
-
- South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)
-
-
-
- Swords to Plowshares
-
-
-
- Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
-
-
-
- Young Community Developers
-

**Quintin Mecke (he/him)**

**Executive Director**
Council of Community Housing Organizations
quintin@sfccho.org

CCHO COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY HOUSING ORGANIZATIONS

**October 20, 2025**

Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

**CC:** San Francisco Board of Supervisors

**Re: Ensuring Affordability in the Proposed Family Zoning Plan**

Dear Mayor Lurie,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) and our member agencies, we write to express deep concern that the proposed Family Zoning Plan, while well-intentioned, lacks a clear and realistic pathway to producing affordable housing in San Francisco.

Our coalition has decades of collective experience developing, financing, and building affordable housing across the city. Based on that experience, we think it's critical to provide a plausible pathway for achieving the affordability outcomes our city desperately needs.

We recognize the importance of submitting a zoning-compliant map to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that demonstrates theoretical capacity. However, as currently drafted, the Family Zoning Plan offers no meaningful mechanism for actually delivering the affordable homes required to meet San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

The private market is simply not designed or fiscally equipped to produce deeply affordable units, and there are no provisions that enable affordable housing developers to acquire land, access financing, or build at the scale required.

## Affordability Is San Francisco's Defining Challenge

Affordability is the single most urgent issue facing San Franciscans today. Yet the Family Zoning Plan—like many initiatives before it—relies heavily on the private market to deliver affordability. This approach has failed. No scale of market-rate development will generate the deeply affordable housing needed, and inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) requirements or in-lieu fees, while important, produce only a fraction of the housing needed and cannot meet the deep affordability mandates set by the state.

In fact, 57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA—20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units—must serve low-income households. Market-rate development priced at $3,400 for a one-bedroom unit will not meet the needs of San Francisco's low-income families. More than half of family-household residents in the city are low- or very low-income, including approximately 36% who earn less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

The adopted Housing Element offers a rare opportunity to create a bold, proactive citywide vision for affordable housing—one that the private market cannot and will not deliver. Affordable housing solutions must be implemented citywide and west-side rezoning should prioritize affordable housing, especially in areas that are vulnerable to displacement.

## Our Recommendations

To ensure the Family Zoning Plan becomes a meaningful tool for affordability—not simply a symbolic gesture to satisfy state requirements—we urge the following:

**1. Amend the legislation to include an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).**

Establish a clear framework to incentivize and prioritize 100% affordable housing, including additional height, density, or streamlined approvals for nonprofit and community developers.

Mapping and reserving feasible parcels now will ensure that affordable housing remains a viable and competitive land use even as property values rise. Without targeted site identification, the benefits of upzoning will accrue primarily to private market developers, undermining the Plan's stated intent to support families and low-income residents.

**2. Prioritize publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing.**

Designate feasible public parcels—such as **Kirkland Yard**—for 100% affordable projects to ensure that upzoning results in equitable development, not speculative private gain.

**3. Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure.**

Pair zoning reforms with public investment. A voter-approved 2026 housing bond or equivalent funding measure is essential to unlock the 17,675 affordable units currently in the development pipeline. These projects are ready to build, but they cannot move forward without financing.

## A Call for Leadership

San Franciscans expect real solutions to the affordability crisis. We need a plan that reflects how housing actually gets built, not just where it could be built.

We urge your administration to work closely with us to deliver that plan—one that strengthens communities, stabilizes families, and keeps San Francisco a city for everyone.

We appreciate your leadership and stand ready to collaborate in refining the Family Zoning Plan so it truly delivers on its promise of affordability and equity.

Sincerely,

**The member agencies of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO):**

- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
- Bill Sorro Housing Program
- Chinatown Community Development Center
- Episcopal Community Services
- Homeownership SF
- HomeRise
- One Treasure Island
- People Organized to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
- Progress Foundation
- San Francisco Community Land Trust
- San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
- Self-Help for the Elderly
- Senior and Disability Action
- South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)
- Swords to Plowshares
- Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
- Young Community Developers

**Council of Community Housing Organizations**
325 Clementina St. San Francisco, CA • ccho@sfccho.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | "Kelly Groth" |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Letters for File No. 250701 - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | LUT Committee File No. 250701 Letters 10.20.25.pdf<br>image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Kelly Groth <kelly@sfccho.org>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:59 AM

**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Letters for File No. 250701

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good morning Clerk Carroll,

Please see attached letters to be included in File No. 250701 - Family Zoning Plan.

Thank you,
Kelly

**Kelly Groth (she/her)**
Policy & Communications Director

October 17, 2025

**Please support Supervisor Chan's Affordable Housing SUD amendments**

Chair Melgar and Land Use Committee Members,

On behalf of the Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO), I urge your support for Supervisor Chan's proposed amendment to the Family Zoning Plan, to create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD).

This amendment keeps public land working for the public: it prioritizes city-owned parcels for 100% affordable housing, maps and reserves feasible sites, and gives nonprofit/community builders a viable path with modest height/density and expedited approvals. Without these guardrails, broad upzoning will invite speculation, drive up land costs, and make it financially impossible for affordable developers to compete, especially on sites like Kirkland Yard. The SUD aligns rezoning with our regional housing affordability needs and focuses production where deep affordability is actually achievable.

Without an Affordable Housing SUD, the plan won't deliver deeply affordable homes.

Thank you for ensuring the Family Zoning Plan results in actual affordable homes, not just theoretical capacity.

Signed,
F. Joseph Butler, AIA Emeritus
San Francisco, CA 94133

October 17, 2025

Support affordable housing amendment to the Mayors plan

Dear Supervisors:

The Mayors family rezoning  plan does not protect affordable housing units.  Please vote to amend the plan with Supervisor Chan's affordable housing amendments. These proposals are critical to actually achieving the affordable housing needs of the city.

Thank you.

Regina Sneed
San Francisco, CA 94109

October 17, 2025

**Keep affordable housing in Family Zoning Plan**

Please add anti-displacement clauses, and provide affordability clauses in the final draft of the Family Zoning Plan or delay this measure until there is enough protections to keep all San Franciscans to be able to live in the future of our great city.

-Michael Nulty
Writing on behalf of Tenants Associations Coalition of San Francisco

San Francisco, CA 94142

October 20, 2025

**Include Affordable Housing in Family Zoning**

Honorable members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I write to you today in support of 3 amendments to the Family Zoning plan proposed by the Council of Community Housing Organizations:

1) Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD): Give nonprofit/community developers the height, density, and fast-track approvals needed to build 100% affordable homes
2) Prioritize public land for public good: Prioritize publicly owned sites (including places like Kirkland Yard) for 100% affordable projects
3) Pair Zoning with Public Investment: Commit to a 2026 Affordable Housing Funding Measure to unlock 17,000+ affordable homes already in the pipeline.

57% of the rezoning capacity still needed under RHNA, 20,300 of the remaining 36,200 units, must serve low-income households. These 3 strategies provide us a realistic roadmap to meet that goal.

Thank you for your work on this important issue.

Mitch Mankin
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | "Dian Blomquist" |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf - BOS File Nos. 250700 250701 250966 |
| **Date:** | Monday, October 20, 2025 11:44:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Dian Blomquist <blomquist.dian@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 8:27 AM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Fwd: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Dian Blomquist <blomquist.dian@gmail.com>
**Subject: NO to Destructive Zoning on Fisherman's Wharf**
**Date:** October 20, 2025 at 8:13:39 AM PDT

Please vote NO today on the upzoning plans. Please don't let specious promises destroy our beautiful city! Promoted by the unworkable demands put through the California legislature by the same people in the name of greed and not affordable housing!

Thank you,

Dian Blomquist
1632 Taylor Street
San Francisco 94133

**From:** Liam Hennessy
**To:** Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 11:17:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 20, 2025

Good morning,
My name is Liam Hennesy and I am a native San Franciscan who has taught Special Education in SFUSD for 32 years. I am writing to you from my 1907 flat in North Beach asking you to not include North Beach in the Up Zoning plan.

This little flat of mine has lots of history to it as did many of the other places that I occupied in North Beach before finding this "forever home". I have had a long love affair with North Beach ever since I was a little boy. My grandfather was a waiter at The Tivoli, an Italian family restaurant which now is called Savoy Tivoli. I remember going to St. Francis church( the Irish Church in a mostly Italian neighborhood ) and then going to meet my grandfather at the restaurant. He was also the head waiter at Julius Castle which hangs on the side of Montgomery Street overlooking the bay; as if it really was a castle and royalty lived there. The walk up the hill to reach it was an adventure for me as a child (still is ) with all the hidden gardens, incredible architecture, magnificent views and Coit tower haunting me as I climbed. I still marvel at the beautiful area that we call North Beach.

Each and every day I walk and rediscover the beauty of North Beach. I love to look at the architecture of buildings that Willis Polk, Pflüger, Mabeck, Julian Morgan and others built in North Beach. Not only do I see these beautiful buildings but I get to appreciate the memories of my youth with going to grab coffee at Cafe Trieste each and every day.
The history of the Italians, the Irish, the Chinese make North Beach a beautiful melting pot of which people from all over the world come to visit.

I have swum in the San Francisco bay for more years than I would like to express but I have been a Dolphin Club member for over 40 years. The club's history was passed on to me from the "old timers" who were mostly Italian and Irish. They also passed on the rich history of North Beach and why they felt it was the "Crown Jewel" of San Francisco.
Every day I am grateful to live in "Our City" but most grateful to live in the part that is the Crown Jewel.

Increasing the height limit will ruin the iconic neighborhood that so many people from around the world come to see. They come for all the reasons I  mentioned above as well as many not listed.

Please keep it the Crown Jewel of San Francisco by not increasing the height limit. San Franciscans and others deserve to keep the beauty of North Beach intact.

Sincerely,

Liam Francis Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street,
San Francisco CA 94133

**From:** Liam Hennessy
**To:** Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
**Subject:** No Up Zoning in North Beach
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 10:59:43 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 20,2025

Good Morning,

My name is Liam Hennessy and I have lived in North Beach since 1985. I reside in a flat on Pfeiffer and Stockton streets. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal. This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.

Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums  all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc  will not be affordable to the  individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will create another redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc.  in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead. This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr. Sauter’s donors instead( and in secret ). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.

Please make significant changes to the Up Zoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Paul's and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133

**From:** Romalyn Schmaltz
**To:** Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
**Subject:** General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2025 9:57:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

October 20, 2025

From: Romalyn Schmaltz, North Beach resident

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org, chyanne.chen@sfgov.org, bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, danny.sauter@sfgov.org, john.carroll@sfgov.org

Chair Myrna Melgar
Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, D3 Supervisor Danny Sauter

Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

Thank you Supervisors, especially Supervisors Chen and Chan for offering meaningful amendments to a “Family Zoning Plan” that isn’t at all about families and, as Commissioner Moore stated at the Planning Commission hearing on 9/11, isn’t even a plan by any Planning standards. It’s more of a press release turned policy. And that’s consistent with the personalities pushing this non-plan: marketers-turned-legislators, billionaires who use money like a carpenter uses caulk, and luxury real-estate lobbyists.

I’m Romalyn Schmaltz, 20-year resident of North Beach and working artist, and I like quoting Leonard Cohen. *Everybody Knows* this deal is rotten, and our D3 constituency is bereaved and furious that our D3 Representative sworn to protect us straightaway began selling our most precious public assets to private developers while lining up our lives to be demo’d and displaced. Anyone who’s done any time in land use policy knows this is true. The working class and artists will not survive this degree of upzoning. Families will not find housing. And many small businesses will

definitely be gone with the construction dust. All while our waterfront is walled off from residents and visitors.

So please adopt all of Chen and Chan's salient amendments today including:

ZERO evictions from rent-controlled apartments. Tens of thousands of vulnerable people live in duplexes too.

The Housing Element implementation must focus on affordable housing first. Create Chan's Affordable Housing Special Use District.

Serious protections for our small businesses, like one-to-one replacement.

And please, for the love of your own legacies, land on the right side of history and protect our waterfront from mid-rise development. Fisherman's Wharf is a great location for much-needed housing, but this non-plan will absolutely crush our public waterfront vistas—the reason so many people visit us in the first place. Everybody Knows the scene will be dead without them, and it would be forever named after those who made it so.

Thank you,

Romalyn Schmaltz
North Beach Resident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | paul erickson |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, October 19, 2025 10:07:08 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Apollo Land Use letter - Google Docs.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:
I'm Apollo, a working musician living in North Beach. I'm that guy developers sound so excited about—a new San Franciscan! Before that, I lived in Los Angeles, New York City, and Minneapolis. I love them all, but nothing compares to the human scale, community, open-air sunshine, and free public views of the water from everywhere in my new neighborhood. I can't believe anyone would voluntarily destroy it for any amount of money.
I've also lived in and toured in enough cities to know upzoning kills creative communities. It's true in Austin, which became unaffordable for artists and the working class. Same with Vancouver BC and Portland. In fact, there's no example of a city where upzoning did anything but displace thousands, raise rents, and flatten culture.
Nothing in the proposed "Family Zoning Plan" will make it easier for actual working families or artists like me to live in my neighborhood. It's mostly luxury or market-rate studios and 1-bedrooms.
So please approve all of Supervisors Chen's and Chan's amendments, especially the protection of all rent-controlled units. I'm in a Victorian triplex, so I get to stay under the mayor's amendment, but our neighbors — actual families — in the rent-controlled duplexes nearby can get evicted???

That's wrong, and that alone will displace thousands. Please protect them and the last of the rent-controlled housing that keeps communities together. And please honor all their amendments for real affordable housing and small business protections.
And please seize this opportunity to be remembered as a heroic legacy legislator — PLEASE SPARE OUR WATERFRONT FROM UPZONING. Walling it off is a disgrace no one wants, but everyone will remember.
Thank you,
Paul Erickson
North Beach Resident

October 6, 2025

From: Paul Erickson, North Beach renter

To: myrna.melgar@sfgov.org, chyanne.chen@sfgov.org, bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, danny.sauter@sfgov.org, john.carroll@sfgov.org

Chair Myrna Melgar
Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, D3 Supervisor Danny Sauter

Subject: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan — BOS File No. 250966

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

I'm Apollo, a working musician living in North Beach. I'm that guy developers sound so excited about—*a new San Franciscan!* Before that, I lived in Los Angeles, New York City, and Minneapolis. I love them all, but nothing compares to the human scale, community, open-air sunshine, and free public views of the water from everywhere in my new neighborhood. I can't believe anyone would voluntarily destroy it for any amount of money.

I've also lived in and toured in enough cities to know upzoning kills creative communities. It's true in Austin, which became unaffordable for artists and the working class. Same with Vancouver BC and Portland. In fact, there's no example of a city where upzoning did *anything but* displace thousands, raise rents, and flatten culture.

Nothing in the proposed "Family Zoning Plan" will make it easier for actual working families or artists like me to live in my neighborhood. It's mostly luxury or market-rate studios and 1-bedrooms.

So please *approve all* of Supervisors Chen's and Chan's amendments, especially the protection of *all* rent-controlled units. I'm in a Victorian triplex, so I get to stay under the mayor's amendment, but our neighbors — actual families — in the rent-controlled duplexes nearby *can get evicted???*

That's wrong, and that alone will displace thousands. Please protect them and the last of the rent-controlled housing that keeps communities together. And please honor *all* their amendments for *real* affordable housing and small business protections.

And please seize this opportunity to be remembered as a heroic legacy legislator — ***PLEASE SPARE OUR WATERFRONT FROM UPZONING*****.** Walling it off is a disgrace no one wants, but *everyone will remember*.

Thank you,

Paul Erickson
North Beach rResident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lily Wong |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Logan, Samantha (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Jessica Ho; Li Miao Lovett; Manson Leung; Lamar Heystek; Ben Wong; Kimberly Szeto; Leon Chow; Gabi W. |
| **Subject:** | General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan BOS File No. 250966 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, October 19, 2025 7:42:37 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 10.20.25 SCCD LUT Committee Letter Zoning.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors, Aides and Mr. Carroll,

Please see attached letter for the Sunset Chinese Cultural District's letter regarding the Family Zoning Plan, file No. 250966.

Lily

**Lily Wong** 黃麗瑜
**Director of Community Engagement** 社區聯繫總監
**Sunset Chinese Cultural District Director** 日落區中華文化區總監

**1400 Judah Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94122**
**415-665-4212 | *wahmei.org***
***sfsccd.org***
**Direct: (707) 653-5813**

SUNSET CHINESE CULTURAL DISTRICT
日落區中華文化區

**October 19. 2025**

**TO:** Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
**FROM:** Sunset Chinese Cultural District Housing Sub-Committee

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Family Zoning Amendments – **The Critical Need for Funding**

Honorable Supervisors,

I submit this comment regarding the zoning changes under consideration, on behalf of the **Sunset Chinese Cultural District (SCCD)'s Housing Sub-Committee.**

We recognize and strongly support that zoning reform is an essential step toward addressing San Francisco's deep-seated housing and affordability crisis. However, while new zoning maps and increased density are necessary, they are not, on their own, sufficient to protect and stabilize communities like the Sunset District.

## Impact on the Sunset District

The Sunset is a unique, historic, and culturally rich community, home to a significant population of working-class families, seniors, and Chinese American residents. The Cultural District's 2025 July Westside Housing Convening highlights the primary concerns of residents: a fear of displacement, the loss of essential culturally competent small businesses, and inadequate infrastructure (such as parking and transit) to support increased density.

We recognize that zoning modifications are a part of the mix of solutions that help drive housing affordability. However, **protective measures for existing situations are critical to a sustainable neighborhood and would better align with community interests for its legislative passage.** Without the targeted protective measures and resources required to implement them, we create a fertile environment for land speculation, potentially leading to the demolition of buildings that house our long-standing small businesses and the very heart of SCCD's placemaking efforts. As the Cultural District's work, including the community feedback received in the 2025 July 26 Housing Convening, underscores, these are not just houses; they are the infrastructure that supports the cultural and economic lives of hundreds of families.

## Support for Essential Amendments

We commend and **strongly support the proposed amendments and legislation by Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Chan** that seek to mitigate these exact risks. Specifically:

- **Protecting Vulnerable Populations and Commitment to 100% Affordable Housing (Supervisor Chen):** Amendments that include protections for priority equity geographies, standards for family-size dwelling units, and due diligence to evaluate 100% affordable housing alternatives on public land, ensuring that the family zoning plan has specific measures to support San Francisco's families can thrive without displacement.
- **Tenant and Anti-Displacement Safeguards (Supervisor Melgar):** Amendment making it ineligible for rent-controlled buildings with 3+ units from the local program. That helps protect tenants by diminishing the speculation and creates shield walls against predatory development tactics that target vulnerable tenants and families.
- **Small Business and Legacy Protections (Supervisor Chan):** Legislation file number 250808 focuses on protecting storefronts and legacy businesses is vital. These businesses, such as the local bakeries, markets, and social service providers, are irreplaceable assets that define the Cultural District. We must ensure that new housing is built *with* them, not *over* them.

## The Missing Piece: Funding and Implementation

While these zoning changes and protective amendments represent excellent public policy, **we must emphasize that the vision of the Sunset Chinese Cultural District will not be effective or impactful without dedicated funding tied directly to these efforts.**

Zoning is a regulatory tool; it is not a funding mechanism. The promise of new housing is hollow for the Sunset's low- and moderate-income residents unless there is a concurrent financial commitment to:

1. **Small Business Stabilization:** Creating a dedicated fund for small business relocation, lease assistance, and capital improvements, as proposed by some supervisors, is mandatory to prevent displacement along corridors like Irving and Taraval.
2. **Affordable Housing Production:** Dedicated funding for land acquisition and the creation of **100% affordable housing** projects—particularly on public or faith-based sites—is the only way to guarantee that the new units meet the needs of the working families and seniors who are currently struggling to stay in the neighborhood.
3. **Prioritizing Infrastructure Upgrades:** Investing in essential public transit, utilities, and community services (as raised during the SCCD's convenings) must be an integral part of the holistic rezoning effort, ensuring quality of life keeps pace with density.

We urge the Land Use Committee to advance this legislation while working actively with the Mayor's Office and the Budget and Finance Committee to ensure that the vital policies crafted to

protect the Sunset are financially empowered for real-world impact. The community deserves not just a plan, but the resources to make that plan equitable and successful.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lily Wong
Director, Sunset Chinese Cultural District

Cc: SCCD Housing Sub-Committee
Benson Wong, Wah Mei School
Gabi Wu
Jessica Ho
Kimberly Szeto, ASIAN, Inc.
Lamar Heystek, ASIAN, Inc.
Li Miao Lovett
Manson Leung, Self Help for the Elderly

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Judy Irving |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff |
| **Cc:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Upzoning and demolitions, etc. |
| **Date:** | Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:56:55 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

One of the rationalizations I've heard over and over at meetings concerning the proposed upzoning is that

"Since there have been very few demolitions in the past few years, there are bound to be few in the future."

But in this case history will not repeat itself, because local zoning controls and other restrictions that have kept demolitions in check will be thrown out the window. De-regulation will *incentivize* demolitions because land values will rise so precipitously:

"Buy that building! Tear it down! Build a highrise! Make a ton of money!" From a developer standpoint, it's irresistible.

Don't be taken in by assurances that existing housing for middle-income San Francisco residents will be immune from developer greed.

This is not a "family" plan — it's actually a "wealthy singles" plan, since 75% of new units will be studios and one-bedrooms. How can anyone believe that building highrise condos for well-off tech workers will somehow benefit families?

You can turn this around by refusing to accept the YIMBY lobbyists' rhetoric. You can be proud of the fact that you stood up for small businesses, working-class tenants, and historic buildings by insisting on adaptive re-use of existing structures and 100% affordable development. The proposed amendments to this plan don't do nearly enough. Don't look back a few years from now and say to yourself, "I helped ruin a world-class city."

Thank you.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jean Barish |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Re: Land Use & Transportation Committee Meeting - October 20, 2025 |
| **Date:** | Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:26:41 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 25_10_18 Letter to LUC.docx |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mr. Carroll,

Attached is a letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee regarding the Oct. 20, 2025 meeting. Please include this in their information packet.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

*Jean*

*Jean B Barish*
*jeanbbarish@hotmail.com*
*President, Planning Association for the Richmond*

October 18, 2025

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting, October 20, 2025
Agenda Items 1 – 4, Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood;

I am writing on behalf of Planning Association for the Richmond ("PAR"), an organization representing hundreds of Richmond District residents, regarding Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the October 20, 2025, LUC Agenda. These are Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan" Agenda Items that will significantly amend the City's General Plan, Planning Code, Zoning Map and Implementation Program and Land Use Plan of the City's certified Local Coastal Program. For the reasons set forth below, PAR strongly opposes all of these Agenda items.

Little or No New Housing is Needed

A recent audit conducted by the office of the California State Auditor has determined that the Regional Housing Needs Assessment ("RHNA") that the data Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) uses to provide key housing guidance for the State's local governments is not accurate. Data entry is flawed; HCD could not demonstrate that it considered all the factors that state law requires; and HCD could not support its use of healthy housing vacancy rates. Additionally, the HCD assessment relies on unsubstantiated projections of future housing needs. (https://information.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2021-125/index.html)

Additionally, there are many empty units in San Francisco as well as many other units in the construction pipeline. Planning Department data shows a pipeline of over 70,000 new units. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by over 31,000 since 2020, with thousands of vacant units. The housing market in San Francisco does not follow conventional laws of supply and demand. A body of research shows that increasing construction, especially of market-rate housing, does not decrease housing prices. This is especially true here since most of the new units will be market rate, not affordable.

The entire foundation on which the Mayor's "Family Housing Plan" is built is fatally flawed.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

The Plan Does Not Meet the City's Need for Affordable Housing

The proposed upzoning plan fuels speculative development, threatening to replace existing affordable housing with luxury condominiums lived in their apartments for decades. The City should focus on ways to finance the over 72,000 approved, community-backed housing units awaiting construction. Additionally, the City should advocate for State recognition of housing capacity recently permitted by four-plexes and six-plexes on single-family lots -- the preferred housing type.

The current upzoning Plan will lead to more evictions, higher rents, and the loss of cherished open spaces. This is unacceptable.

The Plan Will Harm Small Businesses

Many small businesses, including over 400 Legacy Businesses that make San Francisco's neighborhoods so unique, are at risk. Commercial tenants, almost all of them small independent businesses, will get nothing in return for being displaced, since California does not allow commercial rent control or commercial displacement protections. A small community-serving business that is displaced for new construction will likely never come back.

Since there is no commercial rent control in California, and 90% of business owners in San Francisco do not own their buildings, every new building that replaces a pre-existing one will result in the loss of one or more small businesses. In addition, there are no requirements in the Plan to have new commercial space sized so that it would be affordable, pricing out local businesses by speculative property flips and rising commercial rents. This would have an unacceptable, impermissible impact on the very heart of San Francisco. It must be prevented.

Density Decontrol Throughout the Residential Neighborhoods Is Unacceptable

The plan includes a "sea of blue" throughout many neighborhoods of single-family and two- or three-unit buildings.
https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6e0e399f9c82456dbda233eacebc433d/#data_s=id%3AdataSource_3-195febbfca6-layer-24-195fe855951-layer-20%3A104373

Those areas are identified as sites where density decontrol could apply. Specifically, corner homes and mid-block buildings on lots over 8,000 square feet could be converted to multi-unit buildings up to 65 feet tall. And all the other homes on these residential streets could be converted into 4 story buildings with ten, twelve, or perhaps even more units. The net effect of this density decontrol is that up to 800,000 units could be built if this Plan is accepted.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

This is absurd on its face. It could result in the addition of over ten times the number of units mandated by the State. This density decontrol is part of a 50-year plan, not the 8-year plan required by the State. Common sense mandates it must be rejected.

Mitigations for Increased Infrastructure and the Environmental Impact of this Plan are Inadequate

The Family Housing Plan does not include a clear plan for infrastructure improvements, including water, sewer, emergency services, road upgrades and signals, transit, and schools and medical facilities. Higher density developments will have many impacts that are not mitigated in this legislation. More waste will be generated, the collection of which must be provided for; there will be more pressure on electrical systems; greenhouse gas emissions will increase; there are no provisions for accommodating the increased demand for parking; and there will be a need for more fire and police protection. The impact of these and other infrastructure issues has not been adequately studied.

Not only must infrastructure needs be considered, but the Plan will radically alter the neighborhood character of the Richmond District, impacting the quality of life for its residents as well as the quality of the environment. Towering buildings in our neighborhoods will cast long shadows, block sunlight, erase historic character, and disrupt the human-scale streetscapes that define San Francisco's unique identity. Further, the Plan allows 80% lot coverage, threatening greenbelts, tree canopy, and neighborhood character, with no updated environmental review.

There will be significantly more congestion and environmental pollution; views will be blocked; and beloved neighborhood corridors will be transformed into luxury enclaves for investors—not homes for working families. All these issues must be thoroughly considered and plans for mitigations of these impacts must be in place before this Plan can be approved.

There are Alternatives to Extensive Upzoning

PAR does not oppose all development. But instead of a massive blanket upzoning and density decontrol plan that will create a great deal of disruption, displacement, and environmental damage, PAR favors a more precise approach to, and submits the following recommendations:

- targeted rezoning and development.
- community participation in all development decisions
- protections for tenants and businesses
- the revitalization of downtown San Francisco by converting offices to residences.
- consideration of environmental issues, the need for sound infrastructure and transit planning, and the importance of maintaining community character.

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

Conclusion

The Family Housing Plan is a betrayal to many San Franciscans, who will face disruption, financial loss, and a compromised environment and quality of life. It is merely a generous gift to developers and investors who will get streamlined approvals and massive profits.

In view of the foregoing, PAR urges you to oppose the Agenda Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 as currently written.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Jean B Barish*

Jean B Barish
President, Planning Association for the Richmond

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Director, SF Planning Department Sarah Dennis-Phillips
John Carroll, Clerk

5758 Geary Blvd., #356 San Francisco, CA 94121-9804
415-541-5652 Voicemail
sfparpresident@gmail.com

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Greg Holzman |
| **To:** | Sauter, Danny (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | Stop the upzoning. Don't ruin our waterfront |
| **Date:** | Sunday, October 19, 2025 4:36:16 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Folks
I have lived on N Point St for over 40 years. I swim at Aquatic Park for 40 years (proud member of the SERC).
Please don't ruin our waterfront. It is the life's blood of our tourist dollars not to mention its character.
In a former career, I built SF Renaissance, a painting and construction company renovating Victorians. Now and for the last 30 plus years, I have built companies that sell organic fruits and juices.
I moved from NYC in 1976. I have tried to be a part of this city and its heart since then. This is still the prettiest city in the USA. Please: Don't Screw it up
Sincerely
Greg

Greg Holzman
Managing Member
TerraFresh Organics
Cell 415 999 2355

**From:** lgpetty
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff
**Cc:** Chan, Connie (BOS); SherrillStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio Staff; BOS-Legislative Aides
**Subject:** Supervisors: Time to Write Your Own Zoning Plan to Achieve State AND Public Approval.
**Date:** Friday, October 17, 2025 4:55:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Re: the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan -
Oct. 20, 2025 Land Use Agenda
Items 1-4, Files 250966, 250700, 250701 & 250785

Dear Land Use Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen and Supervisor Mahmood,

This Mayor's Zoning Plan comes to you after many years in the making at the Planning Dept.

It comes in the name of Compliance with State Law, under threat of "something worse."

But is it really compliance? Or is it simply an unpopular mass of severe concessions and capitulations thrown to an insatiably aggressive State Government?

The Mayor's Plan is overstuffed and bloated with all the things we COULD do, rather than what we NEED to do.

We are delivering to U.S. and foreign investors, global corporate developers & speculators -- everything they could ever wish for -- a deregulated hugely desirable ocean-urban landscape to use for a free-for-all no rules game of demolition, buying, selling, and reselling.

It does not have to
be this way.

This is the time for Supervisors to step up-- to shape a Zoning Plan with moderation and common sense -- listening to those most affected, rather than those who will profit from it. And merely offering a few amendments to the Mayor's Plan is not going to transform it into something that fits San Francisco, or wins public support.

The Mayor's Plan plan is controversial, not because it proposes Change. It is opposed by an unusually large and broad coalition of San Franciscans -- renters, homeowners, seniors and young residents, businesspeople, tenant and environmental protectors.

Why? Because they are opposed to Change? No. It is because they are opposed to Overcompliance. To Overkill. To overly massive unnecessary upheavals with little reward for them or their children, and few protections from exploitation.

It's not too late to fix this; to achieve Compliant Change AND win widespread approval. It's up to you now to create a better way:

**Confine upzoning to vacant land, unused or very little-used nearly empty parcels. Dedicate public lands (including Muni properties) to 100 percent affordable housing, with concrete instructions for funding and infrastructure. Limit construction to eight stories for major boulevards. Limit heights on neighborhood commercial streets and other thru-streets to six-story maximums on corner lots only, with no height increases on surrounding streets. Require a minimum of 25 per cent affordable units and 30 per cent family-size units (3 & 4 & 5 bedrooms) in all market rate residential or mixed-use projects.**
**Ban demolition of rent-controlled units, and remove all of them from upzoning. Prohibit demolition of historical, cultural & landmarked properties, and legacy busineses. Disallow mergers and conversions. Provide tenant protections per Sup. Chen and small business protections per Sups. Melgar and Chan, and make them <u>stronger</u> than they are now.**

This "**Board of Supervisors Zoning Plan"** (together with the Pipeline and 4-6-plex legislation) would be sufficient to comply with RHNA building requirements, especially incentivizing affordable housing.

Supervisors, it's up to you, our elected representatives, to write a reasonable, Compliant Zoning plan that responds to State requirements AND the needs of San Franciscans.

We are counting on you to do this.

A good faith first step would be to hold a Full Board hearing on the Mayor's Plan open to public comment.

Thanks for consideration,

Lorraine Petty

D2/5 Senior voter
Affordable housing Advocate
Seniors and Tenants Advocate
Member, SFTU & SDA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Peter Dwares |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | Housing |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 4:00:00 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Housing the poor, homeless is not affordable. Affordable for Police and Teachers is correct but possible without subsidy.

I have lived on the Filbert Steps Telegraph Hill since 1975. I am for historic preservation, for not tampering with North Beach or Telegraph Hill. It works. Let's not mess it up. Focus on what was deteriorating affected with too little policing, sacrificing safety for Wokeism, permissive druggies on Market Street and Union Square and other parts of the City. Let's build where we need buildings and let's require charm. High rises have no place here in traditional neighborhoods.

**Peter Dwares**
**Dwares Group**
**331 Filbert Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94133**

**415-986-5885 - work**
**415-986-5893 fax**
**415-260-6530 cell**

***Dictated but not reviewed.**

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Keith Robert Saggers |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Myra.Melgar@sfgov.org; Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); carollynandkeith@yahoo.com |
| **Subject:** | Upzoning |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 2:16:32 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I fully support your plan to upzone the Fisherman's Wharf area between Columbus and Embarcadero, Jefferson Street and Bay Street,

To 60ft. and 80ft.

Please follow thru, I live here and it is not historical like North Beach, the area needs redeveloping.

Keith Saggers
2310 Powell St.3462
San Francisco
CA94133

Sincerely,
Keith Robert Saggers
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Yan, Calvin (BOS) |
| **To:** | seankim4@gmail.com |
| **Cc:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | FW: GBMA Support Letter for Supervisor Connie Chan"s amendment |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 12:58:49 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 20251016_GBMA_support letter_Connie Chan"s Amendment.pdf |

---

Hi Sean,

Thank you so much for your email and letter of support.

I am copying Jen from Chair Melgar's Office and Clerk Carroll for the inclusion of your letter to the file.

Calvin Yan 甄錦浩
Office of Supervisor Connie Chan, District 1
市參事陳詩敏辦公室, 第一區

---

**From:** Sean Kim <seankim4@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:07 PM
**To:** Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** GBMA Support Letter for Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Calvin,

This is Sean Kim, Vice President of Geary Blvd Merchants Association.
Could you forward this support letter to Land Use and Transportation Committee?
Thanks

Regards,

Sean Kim

Vice President of Greater Geary Blvd Merchants and Property Owners Association

Mobile : 415-827-4220
email : seankim4@gmail.com
Website :
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.gearyblvd.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo5MTFlYTc5ODA5N2IxMzUzOTc4ZWVkYjEyNzFkYmRjZTo3OjEwNTA6YmYzNmUwNzExNWY0MzE0NjM5MjQ3ODg5OGNjYjdmMWZhZTUwNTFhNzg2NTYzOWJjM2ZhNjk0ZDlmYzk1OGYyZTp0OlQ6Tg

Date: 10/16/2025

Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair and Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

On behalf of the Geary Boulevard Merchants Association (GBMA) and the small businesses we represent along Geary Boulevard, we express strong support for Supervisor Connie Chan's amendment requiring Conditional Use Authorization before replacing a Legacy Business in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

Upzoning grants major new value to developers but offers no protection to the long-standing businesses that built and sustained our neighborhoods. Financial programs such as grants or rent relief are helpful but cannot cover the real costs of displacement — moving out, temporary space, another build-out for a permanent location, and years of lost revenue and customers.

Supervisor Chan's amendment restores fairness and accountability. It does not block redevelopment but creates a process for communication and planning between developers, landlords, and Legacy Businesses before permanent displacement occurs.

Legacy Businesses are more than economic anchors. They are part of San Francisco's cultural and community fabric. This is a land use decision about what kind of city San Francisco wants to be: one that grows with its people, not apart from them.

We respectfully urge you to advance this amendment to the full Board of Supervisors and support its adoption.

Sincerely,

David Heller
President
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association

Sean Kim
Vice President
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Harrison |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); ChenStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Coalition Letter re: Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 10:57:52 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Outlook-A black an.png<br>LAND USE RE_ Coalition Letter of Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Please find the attached coalition letter in support of the family zoning plan proposal.

All the best,

**David Harrison** *(He/Him)*
Director of Public Policy
(O) 415-352-8803 (C) 202-262-5860
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 760
San Francisco, CA 94104

October 17, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**RE: Business Community Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan**

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice-Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood,

As leaders in the San Francisco business community, representing employers of all sizes and industries, we know that a strong economy depends on sufficient housing for workers and families. We, the undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for Mayor Daniel Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco continues to face a severe housing shortage that impacts workers, families, and businesses across the city. Too many employees who power our economy are forced to live far from their jobs, enduring long commutes that strain families, limit career opportunities, and weaken connections to our neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan helps address this challenge by expanding opportunities for family-sized housing in more neighborhoods while providing safeguards for small businesses and keeping San Francisco eligible for critical state housing and infrastructure funding.

**Economic Benefits for Businesses of All Sizes**

Building enough housing to meet our city's needs could generate nearly $5.6 billion in new spending at local businesses. By concentrating new homes near commercial corridors, this plan will drive new foot traffic, create opportunities for ground floor retail, and provide a stable customer base for neighborhood-serving businesses. These benefits extend across industries,

strengthening our ability to attract and retain talent and ensuring San Francisco remains a competitive place to grow jobs.

**Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses**

We recognize that land use changes can raise important questions for small businesses. Importantly, the vast majority of new housing will be built on underutilized sites such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings. This will preserve existing storefronts while revitalizing parcels that present the best opportunities for redevelopment.

In the limited cases where relocation may be necessary, the Family Zoning Plan includes important safeguards such as early notification, relocation assistance, waived permit fees, and incentives to relocate existing or legacy businesses in new projects. We also support Chair Melgar's proposed Small Business Mitigation Fund, which will provide assistance to small businesses while still moving forward with housing that will strengthen our City's economic foundation.

**Shared Vision for San Francisco's Future**

The Family Zoning Plan is a critical step toward addressing our city's housing needs while ensuring that small businesses, large employers, and working families all have a path to thrive. By making it possible for more workers to live near their jobs, San Francisco will strengthen its workforce, reduce congestion and pollution from long commutes, and create a healthier and more equitable city for everyone. When our workforce can afford to live in our city, employers are better able to retain talent and reduce turnover, making San Francisco a more attractive and competitive place to do business.

We appreciate your leadership in advancing this legislation with urgency and care, and we stand ready to work alongside you in building a more economically inclusive, vibrant, and strong San Francisco.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

**San Francisco Chamber of Commerce**
Rodney Fong, President & CEO

**Bay Area Council**
Matt Regan, Senior Vice President, Public Policy

**SPUR**
Sujata Srivastava, Chief Policy Officer

**Advance SF**
Wade Rose, President and CEO

**Hospital Council Northern and Central California**
Michon Coleman, Regional Vice President, San Francisco Section

**Golden Gate Restaurant Association**
Laurie Thomas, Executive Director

**Building Owners & Managers Association San Francisco**
John Bryant, CEO

**SF New Deal**
Simon Bertrang, Executive Director

**San Francisco Apartment Association**
Janan New, Executive Director

**East Cut Community Benefit District**
Andrew Robinson, Executive Director

**Kate Robinson**
Chair, San Francisco Benefit District Alliance

**Ben Blieman**
President, California Nightlife Association

**Cynthia Huie**
President, Small Business Commission

**Sharky Laguana**
Former President, Small Business Commission & CEO, Bandago

**Teddy Kramer**
CEO and Founder, NEON

**Manny Yekutiel**
Owner, Manny's

**Cc: Honorable Members and Staff, San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Christopher Pederson |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Support the Family Zoning Plan - Land Use & Transportation Committee Agenda Items 1-4 (Oct. 20, 2025) |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 8:19:56 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Letter to BoS Land Use Comm re Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attached is the comment letter of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in support of the Family Zoning Plan.
Sincerely,
Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

San Francisco
League of
Conservation
Voters

October 17, 2025

Re: Support the Family Zoning Plan, Agenda Items 1-4

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters urges the Land Use and Transportation Committee to recommend that the Board of Supervisors pass the proposed ordinances to implement Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco and California as a whole face a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from both the city and the state. The scarcity and high price of housing in coastal cities such as San Francisco, however, are forcing families to locate on the fringes of metropolitan areas where the automobile is the primary and, too often, the only viable mode of transportation.Those inland suburban and exurban areas have more extreme climates, encroach on threatened natural habitat and agricultural lands, and face high wildland fire hazards. To address the state's climate and housing crises, then, coastal cities and the state must promote much more multi-family housing located near major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts and in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.

By virtue of San Francisco's mild climate, its extensive public transit network, its concentration of major employment centers, its walkability, and its density, San Francisco is among the most environmentally appropriate locations in the entire state for new multi-family housing. On a per capita basis, San Franciscans drive less, use less energy and water, and occupy less land than other Californians. Providing more multifamily housing for people to live in San Francisco is therefore a crucial step for addressing the state's and city's climate and housing crises.

The Mayor's Family Zoning Plan, by allowing more multifamily housing along major transit lines and close to commercial districts does exactly this. Given that the city has previously rezoned much of the eastern half of the city to allow more multifamily housing, it is appropriate for the Family Zoning Plan to concentrate on western and northern neighborhoods that have provided little new multifamily housing in recent decades. Those northern and western

neighborhoods are also mostly higher resource neighborhoods where potential concerns about displacement and gentrification are minimal.

The SFLCV understands that upzoning can raise concerns about the displacement of small businesses and rent-controlled housing. The SFLCV supports addressing those concerns, but any such measures should not undercut the Family Zoning Plan's strategy of promoting significantly more multifamily housing close to major transit lines, employment centers, and commercial districts.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson
President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan File Nos 250700, 250701, 250966 -17 letters |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 17, 2025 9:06:54 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 17 letters - Family Zoning.pdf |

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 17 letters regarding File Nos:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** brideynewman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bridget Newman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:46:14 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

In 2022, the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Policy Analysis Report stated "With . . . one year remaining to meet RHNA goals for 2015-2023, San Francisco is 10,617 units short for affordable housing, but has produced 6,000 units with market rate housing in excess of RHNA target. In 2020, only 20% of 4,044 housing units added were for very low, low or moderate income households." What provisions in the Family Zoning Plan, with its generous give-aways to developers who build BIGGER prevent the occurrence of this same scenario?

Additionally, if rent-controlled housing is demolished to make way for new condo towers (more human warehouses than "homes"), even IF some of the units are for very low, low or moderate income, what will happen to the rental protections for those tenants displaced?

Very perfunctory research indicates that the diverse, eclectic neighborhoods of San Francisco are among the top five reasons tourists come to our city. If they all become filled with boxes of undifferentiated, characterless tall towers that block the sky and foster wind tunnels, what will there be to see in our neighborhoods?

Finally, transit has been cut back; many of these planned behemoths offer little to no parking. What kind of terrible tangle and road rage does this presage for our streets?

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bridget Newman
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:17:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: I have lived in San Francisco since 1971 and I have never seen such a horrible, detrimental plan. Please, this is not tenable! Don't ruin San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** KAYECHANDLEY@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kaye Handley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:18:56 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:
My husband and I recently bought an apartment in Cow Hollow area which would be severely impacted by high rises and signifcantly increased density.
WE chose the neighborhood for its character and do not want a dense city landscape.
We also don't see how this type of new high rises in affluent neighborhoods will do anything to alleviate the homeless situation.
We ask you to respect and preserve the character of ours and other neighborhoods by reducing new height limits and crating true affordable housing in areas where it can make economic sense.

Sincerely,
Kaye Handley
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** barbara.barbhand@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Handler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:22:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am immmediately affected by the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as my picture window looks out on what will soon be a 6 story buildig thanks to Scott Weiner's actions. There needs to be a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan". San Franciscans do not want the Manhattanization of our communities!

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Barbara Handler
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:25:30 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments: "recall fever" is still spreading.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:52:30 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Hoegger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:02:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:As a realtor broker for 45 years, I foresee the Laurie-Weiner "Family Zoning Plan".as creating a Gold Rush for speculators; many of which will be corporate interests with limited concerns for San Francisco's community interests. We need a plan that addresses affordability and retains the unique character of each of our neighborhoods.
Many options exist for achieving the above goals while meeting the State Housig Mandate: up-zoning intense transit corridors, incentivizing ADU's especially for seniors, City bond programs to finance affordability.
SanFrancisco has historically been a leader in innovation, let us continue to be proud of our heritage.

Sincerely,
Ken Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** neil@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of neil maclean
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:42:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Up Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's modern history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is a way of hiding from the public.
Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

I was born in this city and I am proud of how we contribute to regional and national politics. Our rent, health and environmental protections set us apart from the rest of country. This move, should it pass, models our city after Las Vegas.

Sincerely,
neil maclean
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** rosenstein.jacob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JACOB ROSENSTEIN
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 4:53:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a Noe Valley resident, I'm alarmed that demolished homes of charm may destroy the quaint nature of my neighborhood. I urge you to reject the extreme upzoning plan of the State of California.

Sincerely,
JACOB ROSENSTEIN
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of margaret bradley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:18:30 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear SF Leadership,

We are very concerned for the entire city, it appears the due diligence necessary to make such sweeping changes hasn't been addressed. The ingress/egress issues along major arteries into and out of the city are already challenging, especially on 19th Ave and Lombard. The subsidence issues with building weights is also of big concern, especially when it comes to the sewer system in the city. See Wired Magazine article (May 23, 2023) regarding irreversible issues on the east coast:

New York City Is Sinking. It's Far From Alone

Subsidence is a hidden vulnerability for coastal cities—models that project how much sea levels will rise in a given area don't yet take it into account. By 2050, average sea levels in the US will go up a foot, and by that time, 70 percent of the world's people will be urbanites, up from 56 percent today. In coastal cities, that boom will exacerbate the issue because more people will need to extract more groundwater and will need more buildings and roads, which will in turn increase the pressure on sediments.

"If that coastal migration correlates with building new infrastructure along the coast, it's very likely that we will see a change in land elevation," says Virginia Tech environmental security expert Manoochehr Shirzaei, who did the previous study of subsidence on the East Coast. (He wasn't part of this research team but reviewed their paper for the journal.)

A major concern for coastal areas, Shirzaei says, is the deformation of floodplains. "The area has to have a certain slope, so if there is heavy precipitation, water drains," Shirzaei says. "But when you have structures that create localized subsidence, it temporarily changes the slope of the floodplains. So it means that water would sit there for longer periods of time." This essentially creates a great big bowl for heavy rainfall to fill, which can flood roads and buildings. Even worse, climate change is already causing fiercer rainfall and hurricanes, along with stronger storm surges that push walls of water inland.

And this article in
Wired Magazine on Jan 5, 2025

Critical Infrastructure Is Sinking Along the US East Coast
Up and down the Atlantic Coast, the land is steadily sinking, or subsiding. That's destabilizing levees, roads, and airports, just as sea levels are rising.

We are also having a hard time understanding why we would give away our local power to address an issue as important as this one. Developers, we fear, will be the only ones to win.

We are all for affordable housing but the developers I know say this isn't the answer for affordable housing, it's a coup for luxury.

We also understand there are many projects in the pipeline negating the need to build as much housing that is required by the state.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration on such an important matter.

Sincerely,
margaret bradley
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** marlabastienknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marla Knight
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 5:57:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Marla Knight
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 6:28:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The current Upzoning Plan and recently passed SB 79 could be devastating for our Cow Hollow neighborhood impacted by both Bills.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 6:57:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** kcogorman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of KEVIN O"GORMAN
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 7:22:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

The current proposal is not weell vetted by many homeowners effected. It decimates the character of neighborhoods, does not alleviate low-income access, overbuilds, and paves the way for the kind of demolition we still regret fron the 60s 'development' fiasco. Thousands of homeowners are unaware of the impact of this plan due to tepid outreach. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
KEVIN O'GORMAN
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martin Zanfardino Zanfardino
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:25:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

The Mayor"s plan in conjunction with Scott Weiner and Danny Sauter is completely flawed. Sauter without any input from his constituents added North Beach and surrounding areas to the up zoning plan. He also halted the long ongoing appeal for North Beach and Telegraph Hill to be designated Historic Districts as is Jackson Square. I have been to meetings where Sauter totally disregards constituents questions and concerns and seems to power through his self serving political agenda. He obviously does not understand the specific special spirit of the District. Rather than ruin the waterfront of Fishermans Wharf and the character of NB and Telegraph Hill he has made it obvious he is in support of the developers ( local and not) rather than preserving the History of his neighborhood. Lifting the special use protections for the area is also another travesty.

Sincerely,
Martin Zanfardino Zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:27:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

It's essential to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's disastrous "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** nicolelambrou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicole Lambrou
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 11:40:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 25+ year resident of SF, a clinical and school psychologist - working in leadership and organization development and living in Clarendon Heights. I am VERY concerned and saddened about this upzoning proposal. I am not against development - and support affordable housing but this proposal is negligent and doesn't consider factors which played a big part in many people moving to and staying in San Francisco - including quality of life - clean air, beauty, being able to see the sky and overall physical and psychological health. I moved from NY city - manhattan in 2002 and was so relieved to be in a city that was affordable, beautiful and valued quality of life. That has changed significantly - our skyline of downtown has completely changed - and the city has been overtaken by the wealthy - but there's still time to make important changes. Let's not become the next Athens, Greece - which was destroyed by the developers in the 60's by antiparochi and now residents continually complain about the destruction, pollution and terrible quality of life.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/__https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20191011-the-surprising-story-of-athens-offbeat-architecture__.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplZGNlNGEyZTZmMGIxN2VlNDYxODkyODYxMDAwN2E0ODo3OjIjMjM6ZDlhZWJhY2Y3MjY3OGNiM2E5ZTQ3MmUwYTAzNmQzYjUwMTkzOWZiYmM1MzM5YzkyOTI3OTJkNjQ0ZGJjYTM1ODpwOlQ6Tg
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/__https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/sep/12/athens-modern-heritage-austerity-neoclassical-architecture-acropolis-greece__.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplZGNlNGEyZTZmMGIxN2VlNDYxODkyODYxMDAwN2E0ODo3OmE3Yzk6ZGNiY2JlZTc3YTU2MGU3YjZmMDY3MjkyNWQzYTAzNTBiMDYzMWYwOTliMTUxYjhmYjk3MTRkMjQ4YmYyYzdmNTpwOlQ6Tg

Don't sell out to developers and Scott Weiner. They don't understand and appreciate what makes San Francisco unique and are only concerned about their profits and political careers.

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Nicole Lambrou
San Francisco, CA 94114

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | FW: Public Comment: Requested Amendments to Mayor Lurie"s Upzoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:01:38 PM |

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication regarding File Nos:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Thank you.

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org| www.sfbos.org

---

**From:** Lydia Bruno <lydia.e.bruno@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 2:53 PM
**To:** Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Public Comment: Requested Amendments to Mayor Lurie's Upzoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My partner and I are longtime residents and District 4 voters. We've lived in SF for almost 2 decades and in our current home for almost 15 years. We are deeply active in our community, volunteering in our local parks almost every weekend and organizing free bird field trips. We

know our neighbors by name, shop regularly at local businesses and belong to the local community garden.

Rent control has allowed us to remain in SF and in our beloved home and find stability and community. We've truly found our place in the world and built a life in SF grounded deeply in community service.

We urge the board of supervisors to ensure Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan includes the affordable housing requirements below.

1. Prohibit the demolition of rent controlled buildings and buildings with small businesses
2. Expand rent control
3. Enforce the vacancy tax
4. Landbank public sites for affordable housing for seniors, families and the public workforce
5. Build pipelines for local employment using prevailing wage requirements, and pipelines for creative financing

Remember, there are over 40,000 vacant units in San Francisco and 8,000 unhoused people. We have the housing, we just need it to be affordable, accessible and stable!

Thank you for making sure SF communities are not displaced!

Lydia Bruno & Travis Smith
District 4 Residents

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | FW: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan - File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:26:09 PM |

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Jason Zhang, regarding File Nos:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Jason Zhang <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2025 7:45 PM
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jason Zhang
jasonz0762@gmail.com
520 Cayuga St
San francisco , California 94112

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bullock, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 15, 2025 4:04:55 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_966.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 40 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | JANIS and BOB HARRER |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Mary Jane Large |
| **Subject:** | Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:28:24 PM |
| **Attachments:** | BOS Land Use Com 10152025.pdf |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over $9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t}he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where <u>not</u> to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

# Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance: Proposed Local Program Height Limits

**September 30, 2025**

**Supervisorial District 3**



| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kleanthes Koniaris |
| **To:** | SauterStaff |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | District 3 zoning impact – Bay St. 105-foot height limit |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 10, 2025 7:34:55 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Screenshot 2025-10-10 at 18.33.24.png |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Sauter and Colleagues,

I live at 222 Francisco Street in District 3. My building sadly lost a lot of value during COVID that hasn't come back. It still has its north-facing water view, however.

Under the Mayor's proposed *Family Zoning Plan*, parcels directly north of me are slated for **105-foot buildings**. If those are built, my view of the water will be entirely blocked. Based on comparable sales data in similar circumstances, I estimate this would result in an additional **30% loss in property value**. I've attached a zoning map illustrating the issue.

I understand that the intent of the plan is to increase housing, but this **dramatic height increase** seems both unnecessary and harmful to the neighborhood. Developers will naturally build to the maximum allowed height, especially on parcels so close to the waterfront — locking in their own views while everyone south loses theirs. Meanwhile, this area already faces severe transportation constraints (the Embarcadero and Bay Street are chokepoints), so additional density would bring more congestion, less parking, and a lower overall quality of life.

I respectfully ask that you **either oppose the Family Zoning Plan in its current form** or **amend it to reduce the 105-foot height limit north of Bay Street**. In my case, SB 79 would actually be less damaging.

I believe many of my neighbors share these concerns, and that there is room for a **reasonable zoning compromise** that allows for growth without devastating existing communities.

Best Regards,

Kleanthes Koniaris

222 Francisco Street

San Francisco, CA 94133



**From:** Zack Subin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, October 12, 2025 9:06:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

As a D11 resident, I am excited to see more homes near Ocean Ave to support our small businesses and transit!

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Zack Subin
zack.subin@fastmail.fm
192 Caine Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Barbara Heffernan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, October 13, 2025 1:22:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan

Barbara
California

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Allison Ettenger |
| **To:** | Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Segal, Ned (MYR); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Calvillo, Angela (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | District 8 Resident Supporting Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:40:13 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Supervisor Mandelman,

I recently moved into District 8 with my family after living in District 9 (where I lived for 10 years). We love living in District 8 (Upper Noe Valley) and that we can access Muni lines (the J, 24, 36, and many others) and also can walk to my daughter's preschool and Upper Noe Recreation Center. We nearly relocated to the East Bay this past year due to a lack of suitable housing options. But we're so glad we stayed in SF, and I am looking forward to finding a kindergarten program for my daughter in SFUSD (hopefully at Alvarado or Dolores Huerta) to keep deepening our roots in the community.

I'm writing to ask you to support the Family Zoning Plan which is coming to the Board of Supervisors soon. By allowing small- and mid-scale apartments across more neighborhoods—especially along safe, transit-served corridors—it helps deliver the types of homes families actually use: multi-bedroom units close to childcare, after-school programs, and open space. This is essential to keeping families tied to the community and increases our well-being.

My friends and neighbors (in Districts 8 and 9, both current and former) are following this legislation closely. We are hopeful you and your colleagues can make real progress on the city's housing shortage.

Many thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Allison Ettenger

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Tim Omi |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Segal, Ned (MYR); alyssa@talaryabrands.com; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Tang, Katy (ECN); commissionstreamlining |
| **Subject:** | SFCDMA Support for the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Friday, October 10, 2025 10:33:38 AM |
| **Attachments:** | CDMA Letter of Support Family Zoning .pdf |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Timothy Omi
tim@sfcdma.org
1-415-590-0930
President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
President, Fillmore Merchant Association

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you that the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations (SFCDMA) has formally voted to support the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan. After extensive deliberation and numerous conversations with the Planning Department, Supervisors, and Mayors office a majority of our board reached consensus in favor of this important measure.

Back in August, SFCDMA proposed three key additions to the Family Zoning Plan aimed at mitigating small business displacement and reducing the potential negative impacts of large construction projects on our commercial corridors. These corridors form the backbone of San Francisco's neighborhoods — they are where small businesses give our city its identity, culture, and sense of community.

We deeply appreciate the collaborative process that has allowed merchants and community leaders to engage directly with the Mayor's Office and members of the Board. The open dialogue and responsiveness we have experienced mark a positive new chapter in how small businesses participate in shaping city policy.

We are also encouraged that Supervisor Melgar's proposals — including restaurant displacement assistance, expanded buildout support, and an increase to the small business displacement cap — will be incorporated into the plan. Additionally, we urge the City to move quickly to establish a Small Business Displacement Fund in good faith and to implement the incentive for in-kind commercial space replacement within the developer incentive program, as discussed with the Planning Department.

Thank you for your partnership and for ensuring that San Francisco's growth continues to include — and protect — the small businesses that make our city vibrant.

Sincerely,
Timothy Omi
President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

**From:** Justin Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Saturday, October 4, 2025 10:21:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:34 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:45 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:04:01 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Giampaoli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:36:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): It will not be low income. It will just take away light and bring in more empty storefronts ruining our beautiful neighborhoods. Just making the builders richer and they don't care about anything but themselves. So many empty buildings in SF to fix and house people. Teachers, etc won't be able to afford these buildings.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:39:01 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** symondspaula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Symonds
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:13:16 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a San Franciscan of 80+ years i know that our city has been known around the world for its jewel like beauty. We can add affordable housing without turning San Francisco into a high rise jungle. We need parks and trees. We do not need towers. We can find ways to add affordable housing using creativity but the bash and burn of our leaders seems to them to be easier. There is no imagination in this plan only ways for the rich to get richer.

Sincerely,
Paula Symonds
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of martin zanfardino
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:33 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
martin zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jlzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of judith zimrin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
judith zimrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** PhilD0210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Dillard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:32:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mark.r.berwick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Berwick
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Monday, October 6, 2025 8:04:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please consider the long term implications of this plan and strongly question the flawed justifications being used to push it through. The consequences of allowing this plan to move forward are huge for residents and the future of the city. From everything I've read, we don't need these more units to comply with the state's requirements (we need to look more closely at what's available), the growth forecasts being used are completely disconnected with reality of our city's growth in recent years (which is actually shrinking), and simply adding units has not proven to be an effective means to improve affordability. Please give this further consideration and diligently review the assumptions, the need and the resulting indelible changes we'll all suffer.

Sincerely,
Mark Berwick
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 10:51:40 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

As passed by the Planning Commission, the plan would do little to provide reasonably priced housing, force people out of existing housing, overburden the infrastructure, and destroy the character of a city that earns a lot of money as a place tourists want to visit.

I urge you to scale this plan back drastically and find a more measured, step-by-step approach to the issue.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** Jared Boot-Haury
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:25:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jared Boot-Haury
jwboot3@icloud.com
351 King St, Unit 122
San Francisco, California 94158

**From:** Derek Gendvil
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:27:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Derek Gendvil
dgendvil@gmail.com
9030 w. Sahara ave. #360
Las Vegas , Nevada 89117

**From:** Sandy Carter
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:36:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Sandy Carter
carters989@gmail.com
740 Anza Street
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Noah Garcia
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:38:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Noah Garcia (D5 Resident)

Noah Garcia
noahgarcia80@gmail.com
564 Fell St
San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** Samah Shah
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:53:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

I've lived in the Richmond of 6 years and this neighbourhood especially urgently needs more homes. We have not built enough housing for our residents and the people who work here, but this plan finally moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Samah Shah
samahsemail@gmail.com
1732 Anza St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Casey Frost
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:02:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Casey Frost
caseyfrost13@gmail.com
111 Monterey Blvd
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** Leah Loversky
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:22:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Leah Loversky
ldloversky@gmail.com
1207 CHESTNUT ST APT 10
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** Mark Goldberg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:27:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Mark Goldberg
mark.goldbergsf@gmail.com
2362 Bay Street
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Teresa Dal Santo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:30:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Teresa Dal Santo
dalsantot@gmail.com
2031 Powell Street,
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** teeeets@gmail.com
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:42:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

teeeets@gmail.com
838 Anza St
Sf, California 94118

**From:** Anthony Criscione
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:42:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anthony Criscione
acriscione1997@gmail.com
145 San Jose Avenue
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** Justin Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:23:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** shsetterfield@gmail.com
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:59:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

shsetterfield@gmail.com
88 Hoff St, #206
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** John Steponaitis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:54:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

John Steponaitis
steponaj@gmail.com
910 Geary 20
San Francisco, California 94109-7095

**From:** Shane Booth
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 6:52:46 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Shane Booth
shanerama@gmail.com
112 Delano Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Patrick Le
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:03:09 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** James Lemaire
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:22:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

James Lemaire
james.roderick.lemaire@gmail.com
3685 17th St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Irene Koo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:36:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

As a resident of D1 Inner Richmond, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I especially hope my own Supervisor Connie Chan hears our voices in support of this plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

I imagine raising a family here in SF, and I'd love for it to be in the Inner Richmond and in a city where the Family Zoning Plan is making the city we love, even better.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Irene Koo
irenekoo08@gmail.com
157 8th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Brandon Jackson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:11:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live South of Market, and by far the majority of housing built in recent decades in San Francisco has been around my neighborhood. But much of this housing is not suitable for families or mixed-age households.

Meanwhile, the west side of the city has built very little housing in recent decades, and has continually resisted even modest proposals to increase housing. We do not need drastic upzoning of the west side in order to improve this situation. The changes proposed in the Family Zoning Plan will go a long way to achieving this goal, and I urge you to support this for the benefit of ALL San Franciscans.

Respectfully,
Brandon Jackson

Brandon Jackson
brandonmjackson77@gmail.com
68 Harriet Street, Unit 7
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** Westside Observer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Lurie"s Zoning Plan • Streamlining"s Double-Cross • 29-Sunset Bus Line • Zoo"s Fundraiser • Diamond Heights Tower • High School Hookey •
**Date:** Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:58:26 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

A Future for Westside Neighborhoods?

# Six Fatal Flaws in Lurie's Rezoning Plan

**The recall of Engardio sent shock waves through Lurie's supporters on the Board of Supervisors —
Sherrill (Marina), Sauter (North Beach, Chinatown), and Melgar in District 7 — face large-scale opposition to the proposal.**

**The Planning Commission passed the proposal on a 4-3 vote. Its failure to get one vote from any of the supervisor-appointed commissioners shows the distinctly partisan character of the proposal.**

The growing opposition to the proposal was starkly shown at a press

conference the same day when Lurie was booed for extended periods during his remarks.

## by Calvin Welch

Read More

Move Fast — Break Things?

# Voters Double-Crossed at Commission Streamlining Task Force

## Hey Task Force — Prop D LOST. Implement Prop. E! It Won.

**Weakening commissions is precisely what the Task Force is doing to hand Mayor Lurie more strong mayor authority.** While it was supposed to be a "hedge" against a "strong mayor" the Task Force recommends implementing the opposite.

### by Patrick Monette-Shaw

Read More

Navy's Final Insult

# Plan to "Explode" Toxic Site Endangers Neighbors

**The Navy exhibits poor behavior. Can we really trust their judgment that the buildings located on Parcel G are safe for demolition by explosion?**

An explosion will create a dust cloud that will impact the Palou Avenue neighborhood, with playgrounds, schools, churches and transit lines. And worse, the toxic debris must be removed — traveling down numerous side streets to Third Street, exposing all those passing by to heavily poisonous dust.

## by Glenn Rogers

Read More

Planners want to eliminate 12 stops  for SF's longest bus route

# Makeover for 29-Sunset Line

**The 29-Sunset bus line, notorious for being jampacked with students heading to and from school, may soon get some much-needed help.** SFMTA wants to remove bus stops at a dozen intersections that do not meet standards—800 feet minimum distance between stops.

## by Jason Chinn

Read More

More Information

City's planners approve 104-foot tower in Diamond Heights despite broad community opposition.

## Neighborhood Finds It Hard to Battle AT&T

**The final vote was typical of the Planning Commission today: four Mayoral appointees voted yes. All three Supes appointees voted no**

**The "monopole" would soar over existing trees and create a major new element on the skyline in a part of town where most construction is limited to four stories.**
The neighborhood was organized, and speakers at the commission meeting were 100 percent against the proposal (although 13 people in

the neighborhood wrote to support the plan, with 83 opposed). Speakers noted that the tower would be an eyesore—but also a potential fire threat.

## by Tim Redmond

Read More

Moving captive wild animals such as gorillas, like Cecil, across the country continues the cycle of artificial, high-stakes social manipulation

# Animal Rights Activists Cold-Shoulder Zoo's Gala Fundraiser

## Behind the feel-good PR lies a disturbing truth says Barker. This isn't about animal welfare. It's about control, breeding quotas, and the illusion of progress

**The Zoo is eagerly preparing for its annual Gala Fundraiser this October 18. The recent arrival of newest resident Cecil the Zoo's new male silverback Western lowland gorilla, is in the spotlight.** He was born at the Cincinnati Zoo in Ohio. His arrival in San Francisco at 27 years old marks his third place of residence within a zoo establishment.

## by Jonathan Farrell

Read More

## Truency Is A Serious Problem for California Schools

**In the 2024–25, SFUSD students lost an estimated 4.4 million hours of learning and SFUSD lost over $60 million in state funding due to student absences.** In California, school funding is based on attendance.  If a student does not show up, the district loses money.

### by Carol Kocivar

Read More

## Earthquake Brace + Bolt program *Extended*

**CRMP EXTENDS EARTHQUAKE GRANT APPLICATION DEADLINE**

Extension through October 17 aligns with California Great ShakeOut to boost
earthquake preparedness awareness. Grants of up to $3000 are available for eligible homeowners in our area.

Sign Up

## The Things That Make Us Grumpy

Quinten expands on the recall of Supervisor Joel Engardio, Prop 50, even Trump's announcement last month that he would award one-time mayor Rudy Giuliani the highest US civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Honor.

Read More

PLEASE SUPPORT LOCAL NEWS REPORTING!

Got an opposing view? We seek to represent all sides of the discussion.

Your Feedback Is Welcome

## Please subscribe! Subscription is Free

**But as a Sustaining Subscriber at $5 a month, we'll make your 16¢ a day go a long way! Or become a benefactor. We count on you to keep us online**

**— thanks!**

**Subscribe / Donate**

The Westside is blessed with all kinds of opinions. We try to show all sides of a question. Got an opposing position? Let us know. We're here for you.

*Copyright © 2025 Westside San Francisco Media, All rights reserved.*
You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

**Our mailing address is:**
Westside San Francisco Media
PO Box 170524
San Francisco, CA 94117-0524

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.

**From:** johnpmurray415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Murray
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:09:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Murray
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:22:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Senta Tsantilis

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | JANIS and BOB HARRER; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Mary Jane Large |
| **Subject:** | RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan - BOS File No. 250700, 250701, 250966 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:14:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | BOS Land Use Com 10152025.pdf<br>image001.png |

---

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the files for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 250700
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250701
- Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** JANIS and BOB HARRER <theharrers@aol.com>
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:27 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; Mary Jane Large <maryjanelarge@me.com>
**Subject:** Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over $9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t}he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where <u>not</u> to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

# Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance: Proposed Local Program Height Limits

**September 30, 2025**

**Supervisorial District 3**



| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Vladimir Vlad |
| **To:** | Carroll, John (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | HVNA President; HVNA Vice President; Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Villarreal, Fernando (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | HVNA - Letter of Support - Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:09:38 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 2025 10 13 HVNA Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi John,

Please find attached HVNA's letter of support for the Family Zoning Plan ahead of the Land Use & Transportation meeting on the 20th.

Thanks,

Vladimir

October 13, 2025

Myrna Melgar, Chair
Chyanne Chen, Vice Chair
Bilal Mahmood
Land Use and Transportation Committee

**RE: HVNA Support of Family Zoning Plan**

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice-Chair Chen, and Supervisor Mahmood,

On behalf of the **Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA)**, we are writing to express our support for the proposed **Family Zoning Plan (FZP)**.

HVNA views this plan as a crucial, well-balanced measure necessary to increase San Francisco's housing supply, support our city's diverse family base, and ensure housing availability for future generations. The Family Zoning Plan represents a thoughtful, incremental approach to density that aligns perfectly with the established character and successful mixed-use environment of Hayes Valley.

1. **Alignment with Existing Neighborhood Character:** Hayes Valley is already a dense, walkable, and transit-rich neighborhood. The FZP encourages **gentle density** by allowing up to four units in single-family zones. This density increase is consistent with the scale and character of our blocks, allowing for greater housing production without the radical height or bulk increases that often cause neighborhood opposition.
2. **Addressing Family Needs:** San Francisco is facing a critical loss of families and a dwindling supply of units appropriate for households with children. The FZP specifically targets this imbalance by encouraging multi-bedroom units through density bonuses, helping to retain the very families that enrich our public schools and local businesses.
3. **Increasing Supply in High-Opportunity Areas:** By allowing greater housing production in historically exclusive single-family areas, the FZP contributes to city-wide housing goals and promotes equitable distribution of housing in areas with excellent access to jobs, transit, and open space.

HVNA recognizes that addressing the city's housing shortage requires shared responsibility. We believe the Family Zoning Plan is a modest, necessary, and strategic step forward that will deliver meaningful results while preserving the livability and beauty of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods for residents of all backgrounds.

We support the Board of Supervisors tasked with approving a responsible and HCD compliant plan such as **the Family Zoning Plan.**

Sincerely,

Vladimir Vlad, Chair HVNA Transportation & Planning Committee

Vladimir Vlad

David Robinson, President, HVNA

Joe Maloney, Vice President, HVNA

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Erin Elliott |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Sauter, Danny (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Reject Upzoning plan |
| **Date:** | Sunday, October 5, 2025 2:52:15 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Greetings all.

I live in 94133 and I am against the proposed changes in the Upzoning plan.

Please reject this initiative!

Kindly,

Erin Elliott
Erin@erins.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 30 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 2, 2025 1:29:35 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 30 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.pdf |

Hello,

Please see attached for 30 letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966.

> **File No. 250700:** Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Mahmood, Dorsey)
>
> **File No. 250701:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit businesses displaced by new construction to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts, and 12) reduce usable open space and bicycle parking requirements for senior housing; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; also, amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor)

**File No. 250966:** Ordinance amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program, including the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program, by adjusting guidelines regarding building heights, density, design, and other matters; amending the City's Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**
**San Francisco, CA 94102**
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

**From:** cdmccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey McCoy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:31:14 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

Zoning laws are not just random legislation among thousands of laws; they're paramount to the feel of a place, the quality of life in a society, the amount of sky that meets the eye. They're the promise that a factory or a high-rise won't suddenly appear among single-family homes. They constitute a sacred obligation which a government has to its residents, the willful abandonment of which is an unforgivable betrayal.

Nordic countries, when they need more housing, build out new infrastructure and transit in areas that have not been residential, and then build upward in those "new" areas. In this way, current residents are not betrayed. If they can do this, so can San Francisco and California - the world's 4th biggest economic power.

Sincerely,
Casey McCoy
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:47:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** alicefw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Williams
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:13:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Everyone wants a separate entrance home. Nothing good can happen putting many people in a small space. What kind of infrastructure did you plan to increase? How many more police do you plan to hire?

San Francisco is dense enough. If I wanted to live in NYC I would have moved there!
Surely someone has calculated the capacity for this small 7 by 7 mile piece of land?

Sincerely,
Alice Williams
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** jennkroot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Kroot
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:08:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I will do everything I can to stop extreme upzonging. I voted for Lurie and I'm incredibly disappointed. I thought that he cared about SF more than billionaires and developers. WE ALL KNOW THAT UPZONING WILL NOT SOLVE HOMELESSNESS OR HELP WITH AFFORDABILITY. Developers, Airbnb and tech billionaires own this city.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kroot
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 7:02:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and 30-year resident of North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's and Supervisor Sauter's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and FAMILIES and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We DEMAND that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's and Sauter's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's and Sauter's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as development.

These plans also clear the way for a MASS EXODUS OF RESIDENTS—YOUR CONSTITUENTS. Why are you so foolishly intent on eliminating us? Don't you kinda need resident voters so you can push your weight around?

Think about it (if you're able). WHY BITE THE HAND THAT FEEDS YOU?

Be careful.

HANDS OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 2:55:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 2:21:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei

**From:** shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 4:20:20 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The destruction of this northern/western part of SF will be permanent and we will never again have the unique flavor that makes SF special. Walk around Broadway from Webster towards Van Ness and you'll see the truly brutal high rises that were allowed there. The beauty of the area can never be regained. SF population is not growing, and rushing around adding ugly housing makes no sense. Please vote no.

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 7:17:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** esinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eihway Su
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 6:05:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan who lives on Parnassus Avenue in Cole Valley, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I love San Francisco's community that cares about people who have not been economically privileged, our diversity, as well as our beautiful, old buildings.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eihway Su
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 5:32:49 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

Perhaps you'll get the Engardio treatment for promoting this dreadful plan.

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** leah606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn De Jesus
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 5:18:06 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Please stop selling SF and its residence out. I like how our pockets of different communities have developed; and how we find a way to work with each other, no matter what part of San Francisco we happen to live. Don't destroy the soul of my favorite city.

Sincerely,
Roselyn De Jesus
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Lehr |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); jengardio@gmail.com; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Segal, Ned (MYR); Jones, Ej (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | Strongly Opposed to Mayor Lurie"s Upzoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, September 30, 2025 4:50:12 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I've been proud to call District 2 my home for over 20 years. As a longtime San Franciscan, I'm deeply concerned and strongly opposed to Mayor Lurie's plan. It threatens to tear down cherished homes, push out renters and small businesses, and reshape our neighborhoods into exclusive corridors of unaffordable luxury high-rises.

This plan isn't just about development—it's about displacement disguised as progress. It puts the interests of wealthy developers and billionaire investors far ahead of the families and communities who have built this city over decades.

We urgently ask you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Call for a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

The Mayor's upzoning maps would permanently alter San Francisco's land use in ways that go well beyond what's necessary—and without any guarantees that housing will be affordable for everyday residents.

Together, we must protect the heart and soul of our city from these sweeping changes that threaten to silence community voices and erase the vibrant neighborhoods we love.

Thank you for considering my input as you make this critical decision for San Francisco's future.

Dave Lehr

District 2 Resident

**From:** susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 3:57:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Vahrenhorst-Bucchioni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 3:12:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please safe the unique character of San Francisco with it's distinctly different neighborhoods.  Don't make our city look the same everywhere you go.

Sincerely,
Iris Vahrenhorst-Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:42:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a resident of Ingleside Terraces, one of the few remaining intact Historic Garden Neighborhoods, I implore you to exempt historic category A properties from the current upzoning map. According to recent tabulations based on the city survey, removing these properties will not significantly impact the the required number of new homes desired by the State of California. It is absolutely possible to both meet future housing goals and embrace the past. By further modifying the proposed zoning map, you can gain the support of many of your constituents, particularly homeowners and landlords who contribute significantly to city coffers trhough payment of property taxes.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:31:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a longtime resident of the Westside, but one who has also lived and worked in many sections of our wonderful city, I believe Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I am concerned about this week's attempt to adopt construction guidelines for single family homes that may not jive with historical architectural elements. Further, by trying to eliminate the HPC or to allow the Planning Department to assume the role of historic preservation, more necessary guardrails will be circumvented. Such manipulation does not engage the community in meaningful ways. Having already removed environmental reviews, how will the city ensure that new and modified builds will be transparent and in line with the exiting city plan?

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:14:46 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:13:59 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:13:24 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 11:12:20 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please don't destroy our magical city. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. In 2023, four- and six-plex legislation was signed into law, which created the capacity for ~400,000 units. Add the ~70,000 units in the pipeline, and San Francisco has way more than the net units required by the state's rashly passed quotas and this is all already transforming our city with not enough thought and careful city planning.

The State Department of Finance projects only ~17,000 new residents by 2050 and there are still ~40,000 vacant units sitting empty. In my neighborhood, there are luxury McMansions and condos that have been for sale and vacant for over a year. Lurie's upzoning scheme is unnecessary, excessive, and counterproductive to achieving real affordability in San Francisco. It seems like a blatant gift to wealthy development firms, who destroy our city's history and character and put up huge, personality-devoid buildings in place of it. They have been destroying irreplaceable places and rent controlled dwellings and affordable starter homes for years. On top of all that, did you know that a third of our country's landfills are filled with construction debris? There's no angle to this path that makes any sense to me. Let's do better than this.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps. Why do we need this at all? Who is asking for it?
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees and barely any protections for historic places that cannot be replaced. Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement and the erasing of culture and identity disguised as progress. It reminds me heavily of the "urban renewal" programs of the 60s and 70s. Let's please find better, smarter, more thoughtful ways forward. This is an iconic and diverse and creative and beautiful city, and we need to put care into keeping it that way.

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak

**From:** chrisverplanck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher VerPlanck
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 29, 2025 2:58:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christopher VerPlanck
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Jack Eidson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Family Zoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 29, 2025 1:28:33 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I am writing to express my strong support for Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan, and to encourage the Board of Supervisors to pass it urgently.

I am a resident of District 8, and would gladly welcome more neighbors and more vitality to my neighborhood, the Castro. The Family Zoning Plan puts both my neighborhood and the full city on a stronger path toward recovery and growth.

It should also not be discounted that passing a measure like the Family Zoning Plan is required by the state in order to stay in compliance with California law. Any supervisor who ignores that reality is unfit to serve this city.

Thanks,
Jack Eidson (94114)

**From:** paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, September 28, 2025 8:26:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

I am a resident of District 4. I want to add that I supported Prop K, love Sunset Dunes, and opposed recalling Joel Engardio. However, as a San Franciscan resident and taxpayer, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I have lived in the Sunset for over 30 years. There are many other ways to increase housing in San Francisco without ruining our neighborhood. The Mayor's up zoning plan is wrong for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Justin Daulton
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended!
**Date:** Sunday, September 28, 2025 7:06:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – must be amended! There are other area's in need of redevelopment and revitalization in the city, especially downtown in Union Square and reaching outwards. This should be counted towards requirements and needs.

The current plan takes away the charm, vibe and character of existing established neighborhoods that are are not in need (nor they should be) of redevelopment. As a resident for over 20 years, and whom has fully planted roots in the Richmond distrcit, I whole heartedly appeal to modify this plan to not so serverly upzone established neighborhoods and instead focus on vacant areas that are in need of redevelopment.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

Sincerely, Justin

Justin
California

**From:** joringer67@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, September 27, 2025 2:51:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, September 27, 2025 9:24:22 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, September 27, 2025 9:23:09 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** kirinp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kirin Parmar
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, September 26, 2025 7:41:47 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a proponent of affordable housing who would like to see the proposed SF Upzoning Mandate be fine-tuned to meet holistic needs.
I hold a B. Arch (Hons), M. City Planning and MS (Transportation Engineering). I am also a certified Breakthrough Coach with good communication skills and a natural mediation ability. I grew up mostly in Singapore (tops in building affordable housing and supporting infrastructure) and did my grad studies at Berkeley. I recently hosted an impressive and high-level representative for Lima, Peru's most successful social housing development company called Besco, which is a for-profit private developer. Despite variations in what we can replicate, we have resources to learn from that further include the experiences of Auckland, NZ, Portland, OR and Seattle, WA. We will have to adjust to 1) what our local culture will tolerate within reason, 2) the heightened need for EQ safety and evacuation routes, 3) the limited space to expand making it much harder to meet desirable setbacks, 4) the limits of the existing supportive infrastructure. And 5) last but not least, how we can retain enough of the heart and soul of what makes San Francisco the local, national and global draw that it is. Singapore saved costs by having the government act as developer. Besco in Lima was able to lower costs and create enough profit by the scale of the contracts they keep winning due to their holistic follow-up services business model (in addition to an enforced non-corruption mandate). (Some of the aspects they provide that do not fit the limitations of SF could fit other CA cities, something to pass on to our Senator and Governor). I would like to see more inclusive and thus hopefully more creative brainstorming of a model for affordable building that keeps costs down and gets more buy-in from residents. Also, people tend to be more accepting of change when they feel heard and validated about their feelings and views first. They have been heard at the Planning Commission Hearing, but not actually validated or shown empathy which has further escalated fears and thus opposition. I think it is important that the public feels they have had adequate time to participate in the possible solutions. Things shift when the opposing forces have their worst-case scenario fears allayed, and come to their own conclusions about the possible measures to meet parameters as a result of being part of the brain-storming. I'd like to see the soliciting of views evolve from the negative inducing-mindset focus of what we don of what we do not want, to the pro-active, positive engagement over what we want in order to reach the 36,000 mandated units. Having non-political independent experts weigh in is also crucial. Who can we invite? Retired experts are potentially a great resource. There is such an important psychological element to getting buy-in. I conclude by asking where I can further contribute with my relevant insights, expertise or resourcefulness. I have been active on Nextdoor where over 2,600 folk (at an early count) viewed my post soliciting support in understanding what is going on. After more than 160 comments, things calmed down with the inclusion of my explanation that we genuinely do have a housing crisis that is part of a global housing crisis, and why the impetus to solve this had to come from the State. I personally do not want under the current political environment, to have it look like our governor and senator are doing something that feels like a betrayal as has been implied by the genuinely alarmed. But I do agree that the SF mandate such as it is to-date, is cause for alarm. It lacks clarity on density bonuses, a sense of control over maximum buildout within the up-zoned areas, sensitivity to other important parameters that would ensure we don't destroy cherished public spaces with gloomy shaded or wind-channeling tunnels, and assured preservation or continuity of cherished architecture and small businesses.

Sincerely,
Kirin Parmar
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jun Ishimuro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 24, 2025 8:46:46 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Views and historic neighborhoods are our city's  important resource as one of the top tourist destinations in the world. Tourist industry hire 60000 people and it is a common summer time job for San Francisco resident students. Like all national parks, we have responsbility to  preserve our city's view and historic neighborhoods for our future which will also generate revenues for the city and its residents.

Sincerely,
Jun Ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **To:** | Liam Hennessy |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sciammas, Charlie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Up Zoning Plan - BOS File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966 |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, September 24, 2025 3:01:00 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png |

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the Land Use and Transportation committee, and I will include your comments in the file for these ordinance matters.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the links below:

-

Board of Supervisors File No. 250700

Board of Supervisors File No. 250701

Board of Supervisors File No. 250966

**John Carroll**
**Assistant Clerk**
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Liam Hennessy <dolbay@hotmail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, September 22, 2025 7:13 PM
**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
**Subject:** Up Zoning Plan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Liam Hennessy and I am a long-time resident of North Beach and a recent retired San Francisco Unified School teacher. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal. This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder, BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.
Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc. will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will create another

redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc.  in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead. This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr Sauter's donors instead( and in secret ). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.

Please make significant changes to the Up Zoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Paul's and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 186 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, September 11, 2025 2:37:26 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 186 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 186 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

> **File No. 250700:** Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)
>
> **File No. 250701:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C

(Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**
**San Francisco, CA 94102**
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Beth Chia |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:10:59 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Letter of Family Zoning Plan.docx |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Beth Liwen Chia
390 Santa Ana Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127

September 10, 2025

To: daniel.lurie@sfgov.org
cc:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org,
wtpcc-delegates@googlegroups.com

The Honorable Daniel Lurie
Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via email and U.S. Mail

Re: "Family Zoning Plan"

Dear Mayor Lurie,

The Balboa Terrace Homes Association represents approximately 950 residents, with a mix of families and seniors. Our neighborhood generally reflects the racial make of the city. We shop, eat and do business in West Portal and on Ocean Ave. We strongly oppose the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as it threatens to destroy the small businesses we rely on and will reduce existing family housing through speculative development and demolition.

**This proposal isn't a family housing plan - it's a demolition plan.** Density decontrol, as proposed, eliminates unit limits on single-family parcels. It incentivizes demolition of some of San Francisco's most affordable family housing stock to make way for high-rent, small-unit developments unsuitable for families. This plan encourages speculative development for high income singles that will drive up land values, displace families, and erode thriving communities.

**This proposal will destroy thriving communities.** The proposed unconstrained up zoning and density decontrol will destabilize neighborhoods, drive tenant and small business evictions, and hollow out small, local business districts like Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue and Lakeside Village.

**The state's 82,000-unit housing mandate ignores economic realities.** San Francisco should instead challenge the state's arbitrary and unrealistic population projections, since it is already the densest city in California and the second densest city in the United States, second only to New York City. The high cost of housing in New York City proves that densification does not produce lower housing costs.

**The City does not face a housing supply shortage.** In fact, the Planning Department's Q2 2025 data shows a pipeline of 71,183 new units, including over 10,000 units near Ingleside Terraces at Balboa Reservoir, Stonestown, and Parkmerced. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by 31,938 since 2020, with an estimated 36,000 vacant units. The proposal's emphasis on increasing the supply of housing units is not based on the facts. Over the past 30 years, as the housing stock grew 27% and the

population increased only 11%, rent and housing prices still soared. The development encouraged by this proposal will be market-rate and aimed towards higher income individuals, further exacerbating affordability problems.

We propose the following recommendations to align any zoning plan with community and citywide goals:

1. **Remove Density Decontrol and maintain setbacks, height transitions, and massing rules. -** Existing approved projects in the pipeline and capacity can accommodate more than the arbitrary 82,000-state mandated new housing units without demolishing thriving neighborhoods. Your efforts to reduce bureaucratic and regulatory barriers such as permit reform will stimulate more construction activity more quickly than would blanket up zoning.

2. **Remove provisions that allow 65' heights on interior residential street corner lots and 8,000 square foot lots.** This provision will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision. Proposed lot mergers will invade vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in an otherwise dense urban environment.

3. **Provide for a forty-foot height limit** on residential and commercial corridors.

4. **Protect historic resources and prohibit demolition of existing housing stock:** Require alternatives to demolition of eligible historic resources (Category A). Apply Preservation Design Standards to new projects in Category A neighborhoods.

5. **Provide housing choices scaled for families with children** and increase the required family housing units consistent with the City's family-friendly policies. Preserve the small business.

6. **Ensure adequate infrastructure** – San Francisco's infrastructure will not support massive increases in building even the plan were to encourage it. Providing additional water, electricity, fire, police, and sewer capacity will be expensive and time consuming. Muni is already facing chronic deficits and cannot take additional strain. Increased zoning density should not be approved until infrastructure studies have been conducted and capital projects are approved and funded to support the proposed new development.

7. **Incentivize building the existing pipeline:** Encourage developers to build approved units or, if they do not, revoke entitlements.

8. **Repurpose under-utilized buildings:** Offer greater incentives to convert under-utilized downtown structures into housing as has been successfully done in Washington DC, New York and Los Angeles.

**In conclusion**, the "Family Zoning Plan" as proposed encourages the demolition of sound housing, invites speculation, drives up costs, destroys architecturally historic structures, paves over green space and destroys our sense of community.

We ask that you adopt these recommendations, reject density decontrol, and formulate a sensible plan that preserves our neighborhoods, prioritizes affordability, and includes community input. We strongly

support the building of new housing, but any new housing plan needs to be sensible and include the input and collaboration of those who will be most affected. We demand to be heard.

Very truly yours,

Beth Li-Wen Chia

**From:** covaron@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Varon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:08:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Christine Baron and I live in district too with my family of three children and a full-time care provider for my 24 year-old disabled adult daughter. We have raised our family here and are grateful to all San Francisco has given to our family.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement

I really hope we can all work together to review and come up with a thought out plan to expand San Francisco's housing, which it definitely needs, and I am fully support.

Sincerely,
Christine Varon

Sincerely,
Christine Varon
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** marian.research@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marian Wallace
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:03:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

San Francisco's charm and tourist-attractiveness gets eaten away by the kind of building permissiveness for which these new rules pave the way. Once you start to add high rises so easily, there is no turning back. These are not well-though-out plans. They will not benefit the people of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Marian Wallace
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** cathieanderson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Anderson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:01:11 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

As a senior citizen, who worked hard and paid taxes in San Francisco, I thankfully have rent control or I could no longer afford to live here. In my building as units open, they charge market rates, so the landlords are still making a good income. When I retired, making $50,000-$70,000.00/year - depending on circumstances - that was considered a "middle class" salary and I was proud how I was doing. Now my yearly income is considered "lower class". Social Security is based on our salaries we made before current inflation. Inflation if frightening for seniors.

Many seniors live in our building, as well as young persons. We live well together, and seniors provide history and contributed to life to San Francisco. If seniors are displaced and forced out of their own homes to provide space for unknown new younger, richer persons - where would they go? How is this humane? There are many places in and around that can be built up without displacing the current residents. Seniors naturally fade out on their own - either going to more assisted living, or passing away, or other reasons. This has been a natural turn around for rent control apartments for decades, and happens naturally in our building. We have more younger persons than seniors now.

Finally, building towers in neighborhoods that are architecturally historic destroys what we love about San Francisco, and the living conditions for those around it. Blocking sunlight, fresh air and creating more heat and glare for the residents who live around it.

Recently the building commission approved a building to exceed the height limit of our neighborhood by nearly double for the addition of only 5 affordable units. (842 California Street). This huge modern glass building will block sunlight, fresh air and quality of life for the hundreds of current residents living next to it. It may also add heat and glare to the neighborhood. It destroys the victorian feel of the neighborhood and we are in a major pathway for tourists from hotels towards downtown. Many tourists take pictures on our block as this is what they often come to San Francisco for. It will also be devastating for the University Club by basically building a wall in front of their balconies, blocking views for their many weekend rental events.

All this for only 5 units.

I would like more affordable housing of course, but done in a thoughtful way considering current residents, and the history and architecture of the neighborhood. It feels like just building without these considerations, would be similar to what DOGE was criticized for - just demolishing the good things while trying to achieve a goal, instead of doing so in a thoughtful, planned manner.

Please protect current San Franciscans in your future planning.

Sincerely,
Catherine Anderson
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** gfgoffman@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:53:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:45:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

As a North Beach resident for over 30 years, as well as a Coit Tower employee, I am acutely aware of the universal charm and attraction that North Beach has in today's world. I speak with people from all corners of the planet who tell me how they specifically came to SF just to visit North Beach. Its ambience and similarity to several old world European towns draws visitors from everywhere and keeps locals flocking to the neighborhood. Why deliberately change, no--uproot--an already proven enduring success story is beyond me. Especially when it appears to being done without proper notification to the very residents it will most impact. Please reject this proposal and let North Beach thrive again!
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Eric Dasmalchi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:20:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Eric Dasmalchi
edasmalchi@gmail.com
3333 Mentone Avenue
San Francisco, California 94130

**From:** sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 7:02:55 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I live in lower Pacific Heights and, in my voting district, only three blocks are due to be upsized. I can only assume it's because Mayer Lurie did not want to upsize part of his neighborhood and is forcing the "poor "part of district 2 to bear the full brunt of the upsizing. My street is residential and should not be destroyed! Do not vote for this discriminatory upsizing that will destroy San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** marymmoc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary OConnell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 5:16:38 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, in Cow Hollow ,I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary OConnell
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Ron Nieberding
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 3:37:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Ron Nieberding
nieberding2@gmail.com
18 10th St Apt 640
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** Simone Mittelstaedt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Cc:** Nellie King Solomon
**Subject:** Don"t Demolish SF
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 11:29:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members,

My name is Nellie King Solomon, and my family and I have lived on Bellair, a small alley in North Beach, for 53 years. My father built our house, and my 17-year-old daughter is the third generation to live there. We are the urban fabric of this city, and we are being ignored.

The upzoning plan being considered today is an unjust and secretive attack on our neighborhood. Our community was never meant to be on this map. It was not in the original Housing Element.

New Supervisor Danny Sauter and Scott Wiener have thrown us into this plan without asking or even telling our neighbors. This is being done in secret with developers and donors in mind, not with the constituents' needs. It’s bad politics and possibly illegal. This plan is not only politically corrupt but physically flawed for three crucial reasons:

First, my father, a lifetime city planner and low income Architect, explained that the planned pencil towers are not viable for affordable housing on these sites. The land is unstable "fill" from after the 1906 earthquake, and the substantial foundations required mean they can only be built as luxury housing.

Second, these waterfront sites are threatened by rising sea levels.

Third, this plan is based on a false premise. We do not have a housing shortage in this particular area. Six months ago, I found 40 vacant two-bedroom units on Zillow in my immediate blocks alone.

This is a plan that will demolish affordable housing, not create it. I agree with Daniel Lurie that the waterfront needs a facelift, but let's make it walkable low-rise housing that fits the character of San Francisco, not shady, windy tunnels created by high-rises.

Commissioners, I ask you to stop. Don’t give free rein to these developers. You have a cautionary tale right here in San Francisco: Joel Engardio and London Breed ignored their constituents and their careers ended. Please, do not fall into the same trap at our neighborhood's expense.

Your legacy will be the fabric of San Francisco. Let it be a good one. Remove North Beach, the Wharf, and Telegraph Hill from your development map.

Native San Francisco 3 generations in North Beach,
Nellie King Solomon.

Nellie King Solomon
nellie@nelliekingsolomon.com
www.nelliekingsolomon.com
@nelliekingsolomon

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Joseph Smooke |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Bonde, Aly (MYR); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Zisser, David@HCD; Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | REP-SF Letter re "Family Zoning Plan" |
| **Date:** | Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:14:22 PM |
| **Attachments:** | REP-SF Letter re Upzoning 4Sept2025.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman and Planning Commission President So,

On behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, SF (REP-SF), please find our letter regarding the "Family Zoning Plan" attached to this e-mail.

REP-SF respectfully submits this letter in advance of, and in reference to the September 11, 2025 Planning Commission hearing on this matter which has been previously referred to as Planning File #2021-005878CWP. It also pertains to Legislative Files #250701, #250700, and #230001.

--joseph

co-founder of People Power Media
**Creators of PRICED OUT**
**See the animation that will change the way you think about housing!**

4 September 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors

Planning Commissioner Lydia So, President, Planning Commission

**Re: "Family Zoning Plan"**

**Legislative Files** #250701 (Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes)

#250700 (Zoning Map)

#230001 (General Plan Amendments)

Planning File #2021-005878CWP, and related

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman, and Planning Commission President So:

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) strongly objects to the Housing Element Rezoning Program, "Family Zoning Plan" (FZP). We have spent numerous hours reading and analyzing the above-referenced legislative files, especially the nearly 500 page File #250701 which establishes the "FZP." REP-SF members and allies, people with decades of experience in policy (both inside and outside City Hall), land use, affordable housing development and policy, tenants rights, and small business issues have collaborated on our analysis of the FZP. As a result of this thorough, collaborative effort, we have the following top-line conclusions:

1. **Recycles Failed Policies:** The Housing Element (Table 4.1-5 from the Housing Element EIR) cites statistics from the US Census showing that over a 70 year period, San Francisco has built just under one and a half new housing units for every new person when relating net new housing to population growth. Spanning periods of white flight from the inner city, suburbanization supported by BART and new highways, Redevelopment, booms and busts of the tech industry, the financial crisis, and the COVID pandemic, the population of our City increased roughly 100,000 people, while

developers built roughly 140,000 new housing units. Currently, based on our Planning Department's Q2 Housing Development Pipeline report, there are 71,183 housing units already entitled.

The problem isn't a lack of past or latent supply. The systemic problem for San Francisco is a lack of sustained investment and prioritization in affordable housing. The Q2 Housing Development Pipeline report provides an indication of this imbalance in that only 17,675, roughly 25%, of the entitled units, are slated to be affordable. The problem is not whether San Francisco is building. Both market rate and affordable developers know how to build in San Francisco. The problem is that for decades, we've seen decreasing investment in affordable housing, and an extraordinary over-reliance on market-based approaches.

While we realize that there is demand for market rate housing, we also see the continuing over-production of market rate housing and the under production of affordable housing as a result of political and systemic failures at all levels of government. When we assess the political failings of the past and recommend what bold solutions should look like in order to build a vital, resilient, affordable City, we have to demand leadership and investment in truly affordable housing. Please refer to REP-SF's Citywide People's Plan for detail about our community-led, visionary and practical plan. You can also see much of this plan reflected in the Housing Element by referring to the attached Implementing Actions which were supposed to have been implemented by the end of January 2025.

2. **Tenants Lose:** The FZP rolls back decades of work by tenant and housing advocates to create a network of tenant protections. Landlords still find ways to evict and forcibly displace tenants, but at least the protections we have won have given us tools for fighting back, to save our neighbors and save our communities. The FZP, however, encourages and enables demolitions, conversions, and mergers of existing housing citywide, including in areas designated through prior legislation as being part of the Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District (PEG). Making matters worse, the FZP's rezoning includes PEG areas, and layers local incentives over state incentives to encourage redevelopment indiscriminately, including sites with existing occupied housing, and existing occupied rent-controlled housing.

3. **No Room for Families:** The FZP claims by its name to be a plan for families, but we can only conclude that this program is titled "Family Zoning Plan" to obscure the fact that this plan actually makes it harder for families to find or secure a future in San Francisco. The application of "form based density" over such a vast area of the City, along with the insufficient 2+ bedroom, and even more meager 3+ bedroom

requirements for developments in the RTO-1, RTO-M and RTO-C districts fall far short of qualifying this FZP as being a zoning plan for families.

4. **No Affordable Housing:** Since the Housing Element passed in January 2023, the City has been incrementally dismantling its inclusionary housing program, in some cases bringing affordable housing requirements for market rate developments down to zero. The City has also blocked significant new funding sources for what used to be among the most productive community-based affordable housing development sectors in the country. The FZP incentivizes market speculation, and increases land values which make it much harder for affordable housing developers to acquire land.

   Various state density bonus programs require very low percentages of on-site inclusionary housing, but the FZP proposes a local alternative to the state density programs so developers won't have to build any of the on-site affordable units required by the state (instead, they can pay a fee or skip any affordability requirement and provide rent control for smaller projects with starting rents and rents for new tenancies being at full market rate).

   The Housing Element requires roughly 47,000 units of housing to be affordable at prices market-rate developers will never provide except at extremely small percentages and only when forced to. Therefore, the FZP makes it impossible for San Francisco to provide more than a small fraction of the affordable housing we desperately need.

5. **Makes "Affordable Housing" Too Expensive:** With the last RHNA cycle, San Francisco built nearly four times more expensive, market rate housing than affordable housing. This FZP puts our City in the position to tilt production even more on the side of expensive market rate housing. The impact that this has on the affordability of "affordable housing" is massive.

   Most of the affordable housing produced in San Francisco is either "inclusionary" or "below market rate" (BMR) units built by market rate developers, or "Low Income Housing Tax Credit" (LIHTC) units built by affordable housing developers. Both of these programs set apartment rents based on a percentage of a target "Area Median Income" (AMI) level. Since the "median income" is the income level at which there's an equal number of households above and below that amount, the more we add households to the higher income levels, the AMI increases. As the AMI increases, household incomes for seniors, disabled, and working people don't increase. However, for these people whose incomes aren't increasing, if they live in BMR or affordable LIHTC housing, or if they're seeking housing in those types of "affordable housing", rents are increasing twice as fast as inflation. Here's a sample set of numbers to illustrate this point:

60% AMI for a 2-person household in 2025 is $74,800. Base rent for a 1-BR apartment for a 60% AMI unit is $1,591.

60% AMI for a 2-person household in 2019 (just prior to COVID) was $59,100. Base rent for a 1-BR apartment for a 60% AMI unit was $1,305.

This is a 22% increase in just 6 years.

The Rent Board increases (based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index) from 2019 to 2025 totaled 11.5%, so the rise in rents based on AMI was double the rate of increase for rent stabilized units.

6. **Attacks Small Businesses:** The FZP creates new incentives for properties with small businesses to be redeveloped, but provides no protections or financial support for locally owned, neighborhood serving small businesses when they are displaced. It also provides no support for these types of businesses that will be impacted by the nearby construction incentivized by the FZP.

   Additionally, the FZP directly attacks locally owned, neighborhood serving small businesses by creating the new RTO-C districts that encourage formula retail and large scale commercial uses that will compete directly with small businesses on adjacent commercial corridors.

7. **Public Sites Giveaway:** The FZP proposes to sell off more than 20 sites owned by a public agency, SFMTA, for market rate development. The ability for a market-rate developer to profit by developing a publicly owned site is an undeserved benefit for a market rate developer, but additionally, the FZP proposes to provide public subsidies to market-rate developers if they increase their inclusionary housing merely to 25% of the units. In the past, SFMTA sites such as Ocean Gateway at the Frida Kahlo Way entrance to City College, have been successfully developed for 100% affordable housing. These 20+ sites identified in the FZP should follow this successful model and put our publicly owned resources to use for the greatest public good which is housing that is affordable for those the market leaves far behind.

## There is another pathway forward.

The mission of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition is to build a future in San Francisco with diverse communities, stable, affordable housing, and equitable access to resources and opportunities. The Housing Element, and the required rezoning plan, must be rooted in racial and social equity, and refocus on prioritizing affordability and community stability. Following is our outline, including strategies, for how the City can achieve this.

1. **Recognize What SF Has Already Done:**

   San Francisco has already entitled more than 70,000 housing units that are in the pipeline to move into construction. San Francisco must advocate to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to count as many of the units already entitled as possible in our Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) mandates. Using the FZP to upzone for 800,000 primarily expensive, market rate units, for a City that struggles to provide for the infrastructure needs for its current roughly 800,000 residents in order to meet a State mandate of 82,000 units is absurd.

   San Francisco must also advocate to HCD to count Housing Preservation Program (HPP) projects toward the RHNA goals. This is supported by the Board of Supervisors Resolution #250467, passed in May 2025, which supports California State Assembly Bill No. 670 (Quirk-Silva), to allow local governments to count investments in preserving affordable housing toward their Regional Housing Needs Allocation goals.

   In addition, San Francisco must also advocate to HCD to recognize the significant steps the City has taken to comply with the upzoning deadline and efforts to meet our mandates, including 1) fourplex/sixplex legislation; 2) entitlements already conferred (as mentioned above); 3) streamlining measures already in place including Mayor Breed's "Housing Constraints" Legislation, and implementation of SB 423 before the rest of the State, plus permit expediting measures, plus elimination of inclusionary requirements and community impact fees.

2. **Support & Protect Tenants:**

   REP-SF appreciates the leadership of the Planning Commission and the hard work and dedication of Planning staff to work with REP-SF and the SF Anti-Displacement Coalition on legislation that helps to clarify how the State's Housing Crisis Act will be implemented in terms of developer obligations and the rights tenants have when displaced. We hope that this legislation will provide significant tools and systems to mitigate some of the worst damage to our communities and to people's lives that the Housing Crisis Act can cause.

   We need to clearly state, however, that the "Tenant Protection Ordinance" (TPO) is not legislation that creates protections for tenants. All the TPO does is to detail developers' obligations to tenants under a State program that enables the demolition of existing rent controlled and existing occupied housing under a vague set of conditions. The TPO establishes some systems of accountability and enforcement for those conditions.

   While the State's Housing Crisis Act creates vulnerabilities for tenants, the Mayor's FZP creates new threats to tenants that cause REP-SF and SFADC great concern. The

proposed change to Planning Code Section 317 to allow for the demolition of residential flats without a conditional use permit process pursuant to a broad set of scenarios puts thousands of tenants at risk citywide.

The Mayor's FZP also proposes to remove language that appears in the purpose statements for many Zoning Districts throughout the City that states "Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper story conversions" or "To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited even if such loss of Residential Units would otherwise be allowed pursuant to Section 317 of this Code." These are just two examples. Several other Zoning Districts have similar provisions accompanied by zoning tables that show demolitions, mergers, or conversions to be "NP" (not permitted). The FZP proposes to eliminate all these "NP" designations and revise them to "C" (requiring Conditional Use Authorization). However, as elaborated below, the State has caused the Conditional Use process to be preformative and inconsequential.

We have read Planning staff's assertions that the revisions described above are just to be consistent with State law because demolitions and conversions are allowed per the State's Ellis Act. However, it's important to note that the Ellis Act has been in place since 1985. The protections against demolitions and conversions have been in our Planning Code for many years and have been used successfully to challenge and deny proposed demolitions and conversions to protect tenants from eviction. The Ellis Act is not a new State law for which we need to make the proposed revisions to the Planning Code.

We have also read Planning staff's assertions that we have nothing to worry about because all proposed demolitions will be subjected to a Conditional Use Permit process, and the Planning Commission typically rejects project proposals that put tenants at risk. However, the amendment to Section 317 quoted above directly contradicts Planning's assertion by creating an exception to the Conditional Use requirement for residential flats.

Additionally, the State's Housing Crisis Act very clearly disallows the Planning Commission to deny a developer's project that plays by the rules. Since the State considers our Conditional Use Permit process to be a discretionary process, and since the Housing Crisis Act allows for demolitions that displace existing tenants, the fact that the Mayor's FZP proposes to remove language from the Planning Code intended to preserve existing housing and protect tenants, it is clear that the FZP deliberately puts tenants in great danger. The early draft of the Tenant Protection Ordinance that Planning has shared with us attempts to create objective criteria that developers have to meet, otherwise the Planning Commission could deny a project's approval, but that

would only be afforded to tenants in the Priority Equity Geographies SUD. Therefore, we can only interpret these proposed changes to the Planning Code in the Mayor's FZP as a direct attack on tenants and communities throughout the City.

To support and protect tenants, the City must advance and implement the following:

1. Prohibit the demolition of all existing rent controlled units.
2. Restore all language in the Planning Code for Zoning Districts that says that "existing residential units are protected" (and similar) to prevent against demolitions, conversions and mergers of units that have been protected.
3. Retain existing Zoning District controls that disallow and discourage the demolition of existing residential units.
4. Disallow conversions of existing residential units to non-residential.
5. Eliminate the proposed changes to Planning Code Section 317 that encourage demolitions, mergers and conversions of Residential Flats.

3. **Real Family & Dignified Housing**:

REP-SF does not support density decontrol. The proposal to incentivize density decontrol to half of San Francisco contradicts the stated goal of “creating more space for families, workers, and the next generation of San Franciscans.” This approach will result in proliferation of small units, which are only advantageous for developers and investors, and not for the needs of San Francisco’s families.

To support real and dignified family housing, the City must advance and implement the following:

a. The City must require that at least 25% of the units in upzoned areas and along commercial corridors have at least three bedrooms, and that all unit sizes meet the standards established by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee.
b. Reduce the maximum unit size from 4,000 to 2,800 square feet. Setting a limit of 4,000 square feet is much too large, especially given that there's also an opportunity for project sponsors to build even larger units with a Conditional Use Authorization, and we know that with permit streamlining, a project cannot be denied through the CUA process. Large penthouse-style units should be prohibited as they are always extravagantly expensive.
c. Retain the common area requirement for "efficiency dwelling units with reduced square footage"
d. The minimum size of "efficiency dwelling units with reduced square footage" and group housing units must be 275 square feet. Our member organizations have seen projects approved with efficiency dwelling units as small as 215 square feet

which might be right-sized for an investor who's not planning to live in the unit, but it is entirely insufficient as a "dwelling unit."

e. The "objective design standards" are a step in the right direction. However, the Zoning Administrator must not be able to adopt new standards or revisions to the standards without a public hearing. There must be a process for public input.

4. **Affordable Housing First and Truly, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:**

As REP-SF stated in our April 4 letter addressed to the Planning Commission, Housing Element implementation must focus on affordable housing first.

Please refer to the Housing Element Actions attached in the chart below. Several pathways for funding affordable housing now are outlined in the following Housing Element Actions: 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.9, 1.1.13, and 1.1.14. These include budgeting recommendations, public finance tools, philanthropic and State funding sources, and expanding existing jobs-housing linkage fees.

Lack of available funding to implement these actions is not an excuse. There is more money coursing through San Francisco's economy than ever before. To put this in perspective, San Francisco' population has decreased by 45,000 people since 2019, however its budget has increased from $13B in 2019 to $15.9B for 2025 - 26. With approximately one billionaire for every 11,600 residents, San Francisco has an extreme concentration of wealth to the detriment of the majority of its residents. Planning must advocate for new, progressive revenue sources where needed. Wealthy sectors of the economy must pay their fair share otherwise there is no equity in our Housing Element. Diverting funds earmarked for affordable housing, and not prioritizing initiatives to address these Housing Element actions puts San Francisco out of compliance with its Housing Element and violates the City's legal obligation to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

To put affordable housing first, the City must advance and implement the following:

a. Planning should meet with every developer whose entitled project is not moving forward into construction, and for every developer unable to move their project into construction in the next 12 months, the City must negotiate to acquire these sites for affordable housing development.
b. Engage communities in every District to identify priority sites for affordable housing development. Then, create a multi-site Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) that includes upzoning these sites for greater feasibility for affordable housing, and restricting market rate housing on these sites to the base heights prior to the FZP.

c. Create a real affordable housing feasibility plan.
    i. Advocate to the State for a multi-year commitment of significantly increased funding for the Multi-Family Housing Program.
        1. Any statewide and regional affordable housing bond measures must be additional to a multi-year budget commitment for affordable housing development and preservation.
    ii. Advocate for a multi-year local commitment of City funding for affordable housing development and acquisitions/ preservation.
d. Public Lands for 100% Affordable/ Social Housing. No more market rate housing development on public lands.
    i. This includes the SFMTA sites.
e. Restore inclusionary housing requirements citywide to 2022 levels.
f. The proposed "use it or lose it" provision in the FZP must have no exceptions or extensions except for 100% affordable/ social housing projects.

**5. Market Rate Developers Already Have Plenty of Tools:**

Market rate developers already have the tools they need to develop. As this article from the SF Chronicle on August 28 notes, market rate development won't rebound until housing is more expensive.

> "*San Francisco property owners told the Chronicle in July that rents still aren't back to 2019 levels and expenses have shot up during that time due to inflation. As a result, virtually no new apartment construction is underway in San Francisco despite the rent increases.*"

This shows that 1) zoning is not the impediment to new development; and 2) market rate developers will not develop if it means that housing prices will fall, especially from over-supply.

During the last Housing Element cycle, without nearly as many tools, developers built 30,000 new units and entitled another 70,000 that are ready to move into construction when the market turns around. San Francisco has done plenty for market rate housing short of financing and building it itself. What San Francisco needs to do now is turn its attention to affordable housing.

We hear allegations that affordable housing costs too much money to develop. Two factors can significantly reduce those costs. 1) Use publicly owned land like the SFMTA sites - and other publicly owned sites - so affordable housing developers don't have to pay market prices for land; 2) Purchase sites from private owners, especially those in distress; 3) Commit substantial local funding to affordable housing that can be built without Low Income Housing Tax Credits to avoid the legal fees, application fees,

syndication costs, etc that make LIHTC projects so incredibly expensive on a per square foot basis. Then you can build smaller scale, wood frame, affordable housing on smaller sites in the Well Resourced Neighborhoods, and take advantage of enabling legislation for building affordable housing on sites owned by faith based institutions.

6. **Support & Protect Small Businesses:**

Although REP-SF and Small Business Forward optimistically presented a set of recommendations to the Planning Commission in April of this year for supporting and protecting small businesses, and that presentation was enthusiastically received by this Planning Commission, efforts to turn these recommendations into legislation have stalled. In fact, this FZP creates new threats to small businesses that we could have never anticipated. For instance, the proposed RTO-C creates direct competition with small businesses on our existing commercial corridors by encouraging large scale commercial uses and formula retail.

The overall impact of the FZP, therefore, is to incentivize high-end market rate development, providing housing that small business owners and their staff cannot afford to live in, on sites where the greatest feasibility will be to tear down an existing one-story commercial building while providing no support for the displaced small business or a truly actionable ability to return in the new development. Whether it takes place over 3 years or 30, the effect is the same. The FZP is a plan to destroy the essential fabric of neighborhood-serving small businesses that provide critical linguistically, culturally and economically accessible goods and services for San Francisco's low income and diverse communities, and that provide jobs, vitality, and resiliency to San Francisco's network of neighborhoods.

To support and protect small businesses, the City must advance and implement the following:

a. Displacement Prevention, not just Developer Incentives:
    i. Retain and enforce the commercial vacancy tax
    ii. Require developers to provide minimum warm shell conditions to increase feasibility for neighborhood-serving small businesses such as finish flooring, ADA compliant bathrooms, and lighting fixtures.
        1. If the project involves demolition of a commercial space that previously had a restaurant or bar, the developer must provide minimum warm shell conditions such as venting for kitchen exhaust, a hand sink, a floor sink, and other fixtures to meet Department of Public Health requirements.
    iii. Require the SF Office of Small Business to do proactive community outreach to all small businesses informing them of their rights and

protections, and informing them of the services provided by the Office of Small Business. Small businesses throughout San Francisco are unaware of the new state laws and local programs that incentivize and streamline development.

b. Change State Laws to Support Displaced Businesses
    i. Amend AB 2011/AB 2243 (CA Govt Code Sections 65912.100). The Mayor must work with our State legislators to amend AB 2011/ AB 2243 to accomplish the following:
        1. Require developer payments to businesses with gross receipts up to $2M.
            a. Businesses that were in operation for 1 - 5 years should receive relocation assistance equal to six months rent; businesses in operation for 6 - 10 years should receive nine months rent; businesses in operation for 11 - 15 years should receive twelve months rent; businesses in operation for 16 - 20 years should receive fifteen months rent; businesses in operation for more than 20 years should receive eighteen months rent.
            b. Payments to businesses should include compensation for tenant improvements in the temporary location and tenant improvements in the newly constructed building.
        2. Make these developer payments a requirement for all businesses displaced by upzoning and permit streamlining, including but not limited to SB 423, SB 330, State Density Bonus, AB 1287, local upzoning and permit streamlining programs.
        3. Allow municipalities to require developer payments into a fund to be used to compensate businesses near the construction site that will be impacted while work is being done.
        4. Allow municipalities to require developers to provide a first right of refusal for existing businesses to return into the newly constructed building with a space that works for the temporarily relocated business, and at a rent level sustainable for the displaced business, and within a reasonable range of what the rent was for the old space.

c. RTO-C Districts
    i. Revise the RTO-C to reduce the allowable square footage per storefront, and prohibit formula retail.

7. **Public Sites for Public Good:**

   SFMTA's sites must be developed for 100% affordable housing. Other publicly owned sites must be reserved for this same purpose. If we sell or give away our public lands for market-rate housing while we expect affordable housing developers to pay inflated market prices for land, then we as a City are effectively providing a direct subsidy to market-rate housing developers while putting our affordable housing developers at a severe disadvantage.

   Selling off SFMTA sites is in direct violation of Housing Element Action 1.2.7. This demand to stop selling off our public lands for profit-driven, market-rate housing is supported by Housing Element Actions 1.2.6 and 1.2.7, which include expansion of the City's Public Land for Housing Program and the Surplus Public Lands Ordinance, in compliance with the state Surplus Lands Act.

8. **Implement The Housing Element:**

   There is a huge list of Housing Element Implementation actions that were supposed to have been accomplished prior to January 31, 2025. The list attached below is just a handful of those actions - the ones that appear in the categories of "Affordable Housing Funding" and "Affordable Housing Production."

   Pasted in here are just a few that are overdue that would move San Francisco on the right track for building the affordable housing our communities desperately need.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.2.2 | Affordable Housing Production | Strategically acquire sites and identify targeted funding for land acquisition and banking for affordable housing throughout the city. This will include lots for consolidation that can accommodate permanently affordable housing of at least 50 to 100 units or more through publicly funded purchases, in balance with investment in affordable housing preservation and production and in strategic coordination with sites owned by religious, nonprofit, and public property owners. Prioritize sites of interest identified in coordination with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Consider sites that accommodate fewer than 50 units as additional affordable housing funding, financing, and operating approaches are secured. |
| 1.2.3 | Affordable Housing Production | Prioritize land dedication, donation, or purchase of sites as a major strategy for securing affordable housing, including social housing and shared equity cooperatives, through partnerships with religious institutions, other philanthropic or private property owners, and non-profit developers, including ownership models referenced under Action 1.6.1. |
| 1.2.5 | Affordable | Develop a land acquisition process and program that permits inexpensive long-term |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Housing Production | leases for land developed with high affordability. |
| 1.2.8 | Affordable Housing Production | Prioritize support to neighborhood-based affordable housing developers, particularly those managed by American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Partner with affordable housing developers to purchase privately owned entitled sites where construction may be stalling. |
| 1.4.6 | Affordable Housing Preservation | Utilize value capture from up-zonings to support large affordable housing developments in need of substantial repair or rehabilitation, to fund rebuilding and financial feasibility of existing affordable units for current residents while creating more affordable homes. |

**The State Already Controls San Francisco's Planning and Zoning**

The FZP that will be heard before the Planning Commission on September 11 targets most of the City for upzoning. This local upzoning program adds to the upzoning programs that the State has already decreed by increasing the "base height" on commercial corridors throughout vast areas of the city. Developers are then able to apply the State Density Bonus and AB 1287 to these new base heights without a meaningful increase in inclusionary or Below Market Rate (BMR) affordable housing requirement. The requirement goes from a ridiculously low 12% to an absurdly low 16% even after a developer has doubled the size of their building and secured commensurate profits far out of scale with the 4% increase in inclusionary.

We hear that the Mayor's FZP is necessary because otherwise, the State might take over its planning and zoning processes. We also hear that the State might withhold affordable housing subsidies.

These assertions don't acknowledge the fact that the State, through bills such as SB-828, SB-423, SB-330, AB-1287, AB-2011 and the State Density Program, has already taken over San Francisco's zoning powers as well as its ability to plan. And, the State is already withholding affordable housing funding by putting up absurd road blocks to critical projects that are ready to go, and supported by communities. What San Francisco needs to do is take a stand and push back against the State rather than ramming through the FZP which is simply an extraordinary package of developer giveaways.

**San Francisco's "Family Zoning Plan" Is Unsupportable**

Profit-driven developers only build when there's profit to be made. Their business model is not to make housing more affordable, but to increase the prices of housing to turn a profit for themselves. There is evidence mounting to discredit the approach of allowing profit-driven developers and their lobbyists to set housing policy, as doing so violates the City's needs,

especially for greater affordability, decreased homelessness, decreasing inequality, and increased opportunity for workers, families and seniors. A sample of academic studies and articles are listed here.

1. "Making it easier to build housing in SF's Central SoMa would lead to modest boost, study says." SF Chronicle by Roland Li, Feb 28, 2025.
    a. "A push to make it easier to build housing in San Francisco's Central South of Market district would yield only 325 new homes over 20 years"
    b. "The expected impact of waiving requirements would be negligible compared to no action: housing prices would fall by 0.08%..."
2. "Build Baby Build? Housing Submarkets and the Effects of New Construction on Existing Rents." Anthony Damiano and Chris Frenier, University of Minnesota, October, 2020.
    a. "...increased supply at the top end of the market may not be an effective mechanism for reducing rent pressures faced by low-income households in the short-run."
    b. "We find that rents in lower tier rental units close to new market-rate development were about 6.6 percent higher than comparison units following the completion of new buildings."
3. "Where Is the Housing Shortage?" Kirk McClure and Alex Schwartz, January 2024.
    a. This study finds that "from 2000 to 2020, housing production exceeded growth of households by 3.3 million units."
    b. In a similar finding, REP-SF finds Table 4.1-5 "California and San Francisco Population and Housing Trends, 1950 - 2020" from the 2022 SF Housing Element Environmental Impact Report which clearly shows that San Francisco's population increased by 98,608 people while the number of housing units increased by 140,687 during that same period.
4. "Upzoning and gentrification: Heterogeneous impacts of neighbourhood-level upzoning in New York City." Minjee Kim and Hyojung Lee. Urban Studies Journal, December 2024.
    a. "We find that upzoning is positively associated with signs of gentrification - upzoned neighbourhoods became whiter, more educated and more affluent in the long run. Upzoning is also associated with increases in housing production, but housing prices also increased."
5. "Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities." NSchuyler Louie, John Mondragon, Johannes Wieland, National Bureau of Economic Research, March, 2025.
    a. "...we find that higher income growth predicts the same growth in house prices, housing quantity, and population regardless of a city's estimated housing supply elasticity."

    b. "Using a general demand-and-supply framework, we show that our findings imply that constrained housing supply is relatively unimportant in explaining differences in rising house prices among U.S. cities. These results challenge the prevailing view of local housing and labor markets and suggest that easing housing supply constraints may not yield the anticipated improvements in housing affordability."
6. "Can New Housing Supply Mitigate Displacement and Exclusion? Evidence from Los Angeles and San Francisco." Karen Chapple and Taesoo Song, Journal of the American Planning Association, March, 2024.
    a. "...particularly in the hottest markets, the new market-rate units could fail to spur low- and moderate-income households' in-migration and exacerbate their out-migration. Likewise, the positive impacts of the new market-rate units may fade over time. Subsidized housing generally mitigated both exclusion and displacement slightly in most markets."

**Conclusion**

The Mayor's FZP is far more dangerous than we expected based on Planning's informational presentations to the Planning Commission prior to the actual legislation having been introduced. The FZP threatens tenants and small businesses in ways that disregard decades of community-based policy making that has built a resilient city through a network of strong neighborhoods. Instead, the FZP provides market-rate condo developers with extraordinary tools and incentives - giveaways for them to use for profit and speculation while tenants and small businesses suffer and are displaced.

All the City's efforts so far to implement the Housing Element have been to deregulate and empower condo developers to build expensive, market rate housing, while no efforts have been made to increase feasibility for affordable housing. Reducing and eliminating inclusionary housing and development impact fee requirements, selling off public lands, and escalating land values through State and local upzonings have all *diminished* short and long-term feasibility for affordable housing.

This imbalance in implementation persists despite the RHNA goals being tilted clearly toward the greatest need, which is for truly, permanently affordable housing. This imbalance jeopardizes our residents, our essential workers, and our communities and violates San Francisco's clear legal requirement to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

We are running out of time. Two years have already passed since adoption of the Housing Element, and as noted above, critical Housing Element Actions that were supposed to have been implemented to set the City on its way toward equitable outcomes have not moved. We need to work together, the City along with community organizations, to embrace racial, social,

and economic equity; to put affordable housing first; and to fulfill our City's legal obligations to truly, Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

Respectfully submitted,

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, San Francisco (REP-SF)

**cc**:

SF Board of Supervisors
SF Planning Commission
HCD Assistant Deputy Director, David Zisser

Housing Element Actions Overdue as of January 31, 2025:

Affordable Housing Funding

| | |
|---|---|
| Action 1.1.2 | Include affordable housing investment needs in annual City budget process and Capital Planning process to identify existing housing funding sources, funding gaps and potential new funding sources, including regular general fund allocations that can be made as part of the budget process and local general obligation bonds or other funding sources that require voter approval. |
| Action 1.1.3 | Create a budgeting tool to track housing investments, including permanently affordable housing production, preservation, and housing services; including investments that advance community identified priority actions, per Action 4.1.3; tracking investments that advance racial and social equity, per Action 4.1.1 and achieve targets for investment in Well-resourced Neighborhoods as referenced in Action 1.2.1 and in Priority Equity Geographies. |
| Action 1.1.4 | Explore the development of public financing tools such as Infrastructure Finance Districts or a municipal bank to leverage the City's co-investments in order to lower direct City subsidy for permanently affordable housing and/or increase feasibility of approved projects. |
| Action 1.1.5 | Continue to develop and support alternative and philanthropic funding sources to deliver permanently affordable housing faster and at a cheaper per unit cost through tools such as the Housing Accelerator Fund. |
| Action 1.1.9 | Advocate for State legislation to expand non-competitive, permanently affordable housing funding sources that would be distributed to jurisdictions by formula, like the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Action 1.1.13 | Conduct a feasibility study in coordination with Action 1.1.12 to assess large employers' affordable housing funding on an ongoing basis to complement the jobs-housing linkage requirements and provide paths for large employers to contribute funding to and/or partner with non-profit developers to provide homeownership opportunities. |
| Action 1.1.14 | Explore expanding jobs-housing linkage fees to large employer institutional developments (medical and educational) who are currently not subject to jobs-housing linkage fees, in coordination with Action 1.1.12. |
| Action 1.1.15 | Increase staffing at responsible agencies for analysts and community development specialists to implement expanded affordable housing programs in relation to increased funding and targets and to incorporate community strategies into the implementation of the Housing Element. |

Affordable Housing Production

| | |
|---|---|
| Action 1.2.2 | Strategically acquire sites and identify targeted funding for land acquisition and banking for affordable housing throughout the city. This will include lots for consolidation that can accommodate permanently affordable housing of at least 50 to 100 units or more through publicly funded purchases, in balance with investment in affordable housing preservation and production and in strategic coordination with sites owned by religious, nonprofit, and public property owners. Prioritize sites of interest identified in coordination with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Consider sites that accommodate fewer than 50 units as additional affordable housing funding, financing, and operating approaches are secured. |
| Action 1.2.3 | Prioritize land dedication, donation, or purchase of sites as a major strategy for securing affordable housing, including social housing and shared equity cooperatives, through partnerships with religious institutions, other philanthropic or private property owners, and non-profit developers, including ownership models referenced under Action 1.6.1. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Action 1.2.4 | Regularly track the pipeline of development sites and land banked for affordable housing development funded by OCII, MOHCD, and other relevant agencies, and develop strategies to ensure sufficient sites to accommodate affordable housing production relative to available funding over a rolling 4- to 8-year outlook and to meet the goals to construct housing in Priority Equity Geographies and Well-resourced neighborhoods per Action 1.2.1. |
| Action 1.2.5 | Develop a land acquisition process and program that permits inexpensive long-term leases for land developed with high affordability. |
| Action 1.2.6 | Continue and expand the City's Public Land for Housing Program through public-private partnerships and use City resources to support the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units on underutilized publicly owned and surplus sites, balancing the financial needs of enterprise agencies and ensuring adequate space and resources to address gaps in community infrastructure, services, and amenities. As part of this program, continue to implement the City's Surplus Public Lands Ordinance codified in Administrative Code Chapter 23A, in compliance with the state Surplus Lands Act (Government Code 54220-54234). The City will target 500 to 2000 affordable units in the RHNA planning period. Revisit strategies as appropriate. |
| Action 1.2.7 | Support the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units and improved transit facilities on SFMTA-owned sites slated for development by leveraging private investment in market-rate units with public funding. |
| Action 1.2.8 | Prioritize support to neighborhood-based affordable housing developers, particularly those managed by American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Partner with affordable housing developers to purchase privately owned entitled sites where construction may be stalling. |
| Action 1.2.9 | Support and expedite delivery of the permanently affordable housing projects in former Redevelopment Areas led by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Action 1.2.10 | Support co-housing developments on parcels owned by non-profits, like sites owned by religious institutions, to further encourage philanthropically financed affordable housing. |

**From:** Patricia Callahan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 12:29:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Patricia
California

**From:** damianinglin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Damian Inglin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:37:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

WE NEED FAMILIES TO REBUILD SAN FRANCISCO (LITERALLY), NOT WEALTHY CHILDLESS EX-PATS BUYING CANYONS OF LUXURY FLATS. THIS PROPOSAL WILL FURTHER DEEPEN THE DISASTER THAT SAN FRANCISCO HAS CREATED.

As a long-term San Franciscan residing in the Marina, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Damian Inglin
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:28:51 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

**From:** sjgorskilaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Gorski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:27:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
We need to scale this measure back as Sen. Weiner insured no height changes post increased height limits and this creates an untenable position in D4. If a corner lot goes up 8-12 floors and the adjacent building is 2 floors, nothing will assist if there is an earthquake to prevent extreme risk in the neighborhood. Also, we need to convince Sacramento to put the right number of new housing units in SF and not accept its minuscule % of about 5,200 units when there was over 50,000 units in reality. Absurdity in Sacramento must not unduly burden SF with one size fits all approach to increasing our housing units.

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:21:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I agree we need more housing. I think addressing the empty offices downtown and converting those into housing should be the first step. I agree that removing old decrepit building around the city and replacing with 4-5 story projects makes sense. I do not think Richmond district should have 10-14+ story projects.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:17:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I am very concerned about being evicted so the owner can upzone the building I live in. I may have right of return but I would have no way to pay for moving and much higher rent in another building. I am a senior on a fixed income.I am one of many and we are afraid for our survival. Please consider the implications of upzoning for citizens like myself. We really need LOW INCOME housing. Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee

**From:** juliedearborn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Dearborn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:15:22 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a senior citizen living in a rent controlled apartment in the Richmond, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan in its current form. It is too extreme, it offers not protections for rent-controlled buildings or the tenants who live in them. Mayor Lurie really sold out the Richmond District with this plan.

I urge you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Julie Dearborn
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** cablecar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wesley Valaris
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:14:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: You were voted in to protect the districts, voters, (especially) including property owners. Now you are showing your allegiance with big money developers as Scott Weiner and Joel Engardio are so entangled. None of these major disruptive changes to our unique neighborhoods will effect you and your cronies negatively as it will those of us that have worked so hard to deserve the way of life that WE EARNED. Maybe it's time for another RECALL.

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** ratt57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug McKirahan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:10:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Doug McKirahan
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** kimmckeownsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim McKeown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 9:59:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kim McKeown
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 9:48:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear [elected official],

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos D8
SF, CA 94114

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 9:46:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** leah606@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roselyn De Jesus
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, September 7, 2025 6:31:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The Outer Sunset has always felt like a family. We may not know most of the people we pass daily, but it's a safe place for families and a wonderful place for connection. I have found community. People actually care about each other. I've seen many people help strangers or ask if I was OK when I needed help. Turning San Francisco into a higher density city is changing the soul of the neighborhood. We are not New York City.

Sincerely,
Roselyn De Jesus
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** laurasparn99@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Parnell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, September 7, 2025 3:32:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Laura Parnell
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Eric Mar
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, September 7, 2025 10:25:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Eric
California

**From:** Jack Huntington
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, September 7, 2025 8:10:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Jack
California

**From:** Dorrie Huntington
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, September 7, 2025 7:34:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,
Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Dorrie Huntington

Dorrie
California

**From:** Rachel Lagunoff
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, September 7, 2025 2:20:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I am a retired educator and longtime resident of San Francisco who strongly supports Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan to increase housing density in key areas across the city. I have been living in Mission Bay since 2008 and love that I can reach everything I need within a 10-to-20-minute walk, including several public transport options.

More people in the city could have an eco-friendly and convenient lifestyle like this if the Plan goes through and more people who work in the city could afford to live here. A variety of housing types (including high rises) and walkable, thriving neighborhoods near transit benefit everyone in San Francisco and more of those is what the Family Zoning Plan is designed to deliver.

Thank you for considering what's best for our city to maintain its vitality and growth.

Rachel Lagunoff
rachlag@gmail.com
300 Berry Street, #1206
San Francisco, California 94158

**From:** Michelle Welch
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 10:51:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Michelle
California

**From:** James Wen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 6:25:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan as a lifelong westside resident. My friends have either been priced out of SF or are living at home or with multiple roommates. Housing is foundation of a stable life. While my friends in Chicago or Austin are settling down and thinking of having kids, my friends and I are debating moving out and having a normal adult life or being financially responsible by staying at home or with roommates. I urge you to vote yes on the Mayor's housing map. It may not help my friends who already left SF, but it will help those who are younger find a foothold in this city.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

James Wen
jgw787@gmail.com
157 Westwood Drive
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Jatinshravan Pathangi Janardhanan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 4:03:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jatinshravan Pathangi Janardhanan
jatinshravan@gmail.com
255 Berry Street, Apt 103
San Francisco, California 94158

**From:** costello3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tim Costello
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 4:03:46 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
- how would this improve the affordable housing crisis in SF? This would be incredibly profitable for developers yet completely ruin the daily lives of the current residents of the neighborhood for years to come.
- parking in the area is impossible already and adding countless trucks to the area to build unnecessary high rises, it would ruin the lives of commuters living in the city
- how could you justify additional high rise units when landlords already own countless apartments across the city without taking necessary action against the landlords that work together to keep the rent high across the city for all tenants.

I appreciate you taking our message seriously as this would destroy the daily life of your current residents.

Thank you
-

Sincerely,
Tim Costello

**From:** James Nicholson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 2:29:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

James
California

**From:** justin.e.donahue@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Donahue
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 11:12:36 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

In addition, I am a resident of San Francisco since 2007 and lived in Duboce Triangle since 2010. I deeply appreciate the fabric of our neighborhood, and it deeply saddens me that we're choosing to upzone the neighborhoods of the historic homes that make our city world famous. People come all around the world to see our Victorians, and these plans will destroy what we've curated and protected for over a century. It's a short-sided plan that takes into no consideration HISTORY. Take a step back, take the time and rethink the plan. Look at the buildings that have been built over the past few decades. The buildings that have already destroyed the beauty of our neighborhoods. Upzone THOSE buildings. They are big ugly boxes that will (are already) falling apart with due to their cheap materials. Use this opportunity to bring new life to those areas when those ugly dilapidations are ready for revival.

Sincerely,
Justin Donahue
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** katmacdphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn MacDonald
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 8:53:13 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kathryn MacDonald
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** nielsp33@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Niels Pearson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, September 6, 2025 7:27:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Specifically, we live on Russian Hill, in a 95 year old historic resource 20 story condominium at the foot of the "Paris Block" itself populated by residences that survived the 1906 earthquake. The upzoning in our surrounds is to 65 feet would destroy the historic fabric of our neighborhood and add nothing to assuage the affordable housing issues in this city. Only high end developers would profit.

Niels L Pearson
President
Bellaire Tower HOA
1101 Green Street

Sincerely,
Niels Pearson
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** dodolist@chanezon.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 5:54:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
DC

California

**From:** dispreg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gene Milleson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 3:21:47 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of the West Portal / Forest Hill neighborhood, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

The plan to build up to 85 ft monstrosities, towering over single family homes should be of sufficient concern on it's own to oppose the plan.

However this innanity is compounded by doing so on the Laguna Honda/ 7th Ave corridor; a two lane road (yes, briefly extended to three) already besieged by traffic the majority of the day. This proposal will undoubtedly add traffic and parking congestion to a neighborhood already overwhelmed with cars racing through as a shortcut so frequently as to prohibit our kids from being able to walk the 10m stroll to/from school unattended, cross intersections or even ride bicycles safely on our streets. Proposing these changes without first preparing for and mitigating the inevitable increase to the current risk, especially to our children and elderly neighbors, is short sighted and shameful.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Gene Milleson
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** jayelliott415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Elliott
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 2:42:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco is a unique city. Just because the state has given us a mandate (and one we can push back on as a Charter City), does not mean we need to comply on their timeline. I am not against building or growth, but as a fourth generation San Franciscan who takes stewardship of our beautiful city seriously, we need to be thoughtful in our growth plans. We do not want to be another Vancouver (a sea of half-empty highrises) or Miami.

San Francisco Leadership should be fighting to balance the future needs with the realities of where we live -- on the tip of a peninusula, sandwiched between two major earthquake faults, with a Westside built on sand, and insufficient infrastructure. In my lifetime, the city has never crested over 900,000 residents and we have shrunk from several boom periods. We also need to be honest about what this housing is, because it is NOT affordable housing. That's a real conversation we should have, but are not.

Therefore, as a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

DO NOT FALL to pressure, resist. Let's work together for common sense, practical and real solutions. Let's stop conflating homelessness and housing; affordable housing and highrises. This is the time and this is the issue where we need real leadership.

Sincerely,
Jay Elliott
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Claudia Stern
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 12:07:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Claudia J. Stern
SF Homeowner since 1989

Claudia
California

**From:** jap94116@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joseph Perez
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 12:02:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern ,
As San Franciscans, we reject Mayor Lurie's plan to bulldoze homes, push out renters and small businesses, and replace our neighborhoods with luxury towers no one can afford.

We demand:

- Scale back the upzoning maps
- Delay the rushed January 2026 deadline

This plan isn't progress — it's displacement dressed up as "development."

Sincerely,
Joseph Perez
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** ryan.darin@gmail.com
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 12:00:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

ryan.darin@gmail.com
338 2nd Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** skreamy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Reamy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 10:51:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Reamy
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Ann Zuppann
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 9:47:47 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

San Francisco has been a world class city of beauty, humanity, diversity and vision. We should not destroy that for the financial benefit of a tiny number of construction corporations. The irreplaceable must be protected while making real changes to increase diversity.

Sincerely,

Ann
California

**From:** kboru@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Boru
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, September 5, 2025 8:32:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The unique value of San Francisco is not being given thoughtful consideration here. This obtuseness is no different than denial of climate change, the anti-vax / anti-science movements etc so criticized by liberals vis-a-vis RW politics. Wake up and rethink this idiocy

Sincerely,
Kevin Boru
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** Gael Bruno
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 8:11:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, Gael Bruno

Gael
California

**From:** Stephen Gorski
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 8:06:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Stephen J. Gorski, Esq. D4 resident for over 35 years

Stephen
California

**From:** lisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa DeMattei
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:54:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please preserve the historic westside neighborhoods and business corridors which make San Francisco unique. Yes, we need more affordable housing options but do this in a thoughtful and strategic manner. Let's consider children and families in our community when making these decisions and what"s best for their future. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Lisa DeMattei
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** letty_lee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Letty Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:51:14 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San Franciscan living in the city for over 4 decades, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement! This is not okay to do this to our city.

Sincerely,
Letty Lee
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** denolacarole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole De Nola
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:50:18 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carole De Nola
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** raander2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rose Ann Anderson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:50:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rose Ann Anderson

**From:** alicefw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Williams
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:49:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Williams
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** mediasusan2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Pfeifer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:49:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Pfeifer
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** egan.eagle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Egan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:48:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, a business owner, and a mom -  I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's up zone plan.

My family and I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- heavily consider the environmental remificatikns
- postpone rhe January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to protect.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Egan
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** epoulos63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elisa Poulos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:48:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elisa Poulos
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** qwertyuiopfox@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fox
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Fox
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** epoulos63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of elisa poulos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement!

Sincerely,
elisa poulos
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** kathygrogan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Grogan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kathy Grogan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** jentobiason@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Tobiason
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:46:06 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please put more thought into our next steps and please do not upzone on this mass scale.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Tobiason
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** mediasusan2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Pfeifer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 7:45:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Pfeifer
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Celeste May
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 6:30:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,Celeste May

Celeste
California

**From:** terese.t8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terese Tortorelli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 5:47:43 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terese Tortorelli
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** j.barulich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J. Barulich
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 4:30:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Who benefits from the proposed changes? Current residents who already experience a shortage of infrastructure items such as Police, Fire, transportation, aging sewer systems, parking, and other services that adding more units to will only make worse? No. Developers who stand to make big bucks, and politicians who are wooed, wined, and dined by same? Yes. It's a common theme that repeats itself over and over: Developers destroy middle class residents for high rise stacks of units, make their money, then move to the next community leaving the remaining residents to deal with the overburdened infrastructure and destruction of the quality of life they previously enjoyed. Call it what you will, but stewardship of neighborhood character deserves consideration.

Sincerely,
J. Barulich
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** nbsphoto@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Naomi Barulich
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 3:29:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Changing the character of the Sunset hurts the vibrancy of our City. Luxury developers will command market rates. How does this help families and minimum wage workers stay in SF? The property across from Sloat has NO commercial renters. Your experiment there isn't working. And only 30% rented?!

Sincerely,
Naomi Barulich
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | buscafusco@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of P Buscafusco |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:54:05 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family has owned businesses and properties in the Sunset since 1946 and I find this plan of Mayor Lurie's to be thoroughly corrupt, unconscionable and based on an absolutely preposterous claim of a housing crisis.

Anyone who signs on to this will forever be remembered as someone who betrayed their constituents, someone who betrayed San Franciscans, specifically for the suspicious business interests that have already been fooling around in the politics of the Sunset, namely Jeremy Stoppelman, Lucas Lux, et al.

We call upon you to completely eliminate any existing upzoning plans and request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Sincerely,
P Buscafusco
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** fraley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fraley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:49:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please take our plea for help seriously -- we feel threatened as a family style neighborhood in the Outer Sunset, by extreme plans for development.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Fraley
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** maryfburns@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Burns
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:20:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, and a resident of West Portal, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I have seen the promise of “affordable” housing disappear when developers show up. SF’s population is decreasing, there are some 90,000 units already in the pipeline, and there is plenty of space on the West Side for reasonably priced apartment buildings without the outrageous demolition of small homes that give our neighborhoods their family character.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary Burns

**From:** angelasolleder@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANGELA SOLLEDER
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 2:47:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
ANGELA SOLLEDER
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** angelasolleder@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANGELA SOLLEDER
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 2:45:46 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
ANGELA SOLLEDER
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** Luke3580@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luke Perkocha
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 2:39:56 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am NOT opposed to thoughtful upzoning, and in fact want it, so that I can downsize my dwelling needs and my daughter can return to live here. However, this plan is too radical, too rushed, too long term ("generational" or "50 year") and is being done without sufficient transparency for or input from the public. Many citizens are unaware of the plan, due to insufficient notification. The postcard, sent only recently, and only after political pressure, is very uninformative, without any details of the plan or its implications. San Francisco already has the second highest density of any American City, behind only New York. It is also unique in being only 49 square miles, bounded on 3 sides by water. As a charter city, it should have more latitude in permitting local control. Zoning is only ONE component of MANY local and state policy errors which have made San Francisco housing so expensive, including but not limited to: permitting costs and inefficiencies, ineffective, yet expensive climate change building mandates, costly union and ideologically promoted construction hiring, building and work rules and anti-landlord rent control and tenant policies that discourage development of rental housing as well as rental unit turnover. As a "magnet" city, internationally known for its beauty and a seat of high tech innovation, it also attracts wealthy tenants and buyers, many of whom are buying primarily as an investment, and not for personal use. This ill-considered plan has manifold and hidden unintended consequences which can easily destroy the charm and character that makes neighborhoods in the City attractive, and will do so without improving affordability. The plan could permit massive density increases that completely transform long established, yet still always changing neighborhoods, and are not even needed to meet state mandates, when pipeline projects are considered. Notwithstanding state mandates, it is the responsibility of local leaders, as City stewards, to push back vigorously when external mandates are inappropriate. I urge you to do this. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Luke Perkocha
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Michael Barrango |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Monday, September 8, 2025 2:36:35 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please vote no on the Family Zoning Plan. I believe this upzoning plan heavily favors developers and real estate speculators at the expense of residents (homeowners and renters alike) and small businesses. In addition, what would be the effect on the infrastructure with such large developments.

I am not against raising height limits within reason and I fully realize the need for additional affordable housing units. But there is no incentive for developers to have affordable units if the building is less than 10 stories. There are quite a few housing projects already in the works that would bring San Francisco close to the State mandated housing requirement. We do not need to have gigantic skyscrapers all over the city.

Respectfully,
Alice Barrango

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 2:33:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 2:30:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** cyssf2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Shih
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 2:29:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My addition: I have lived in SF since 1983, my mother was born here. For the first time in all those decades I am seriously considering leaving SF IF the family zoning plan is passed. Your plan would put an 8 story building RIGHT NEXT TO MY HOUSE and all along Geary Blvd. Geary Blvd is not a monolithic traffic artery. Yes, there are many commercial buildings and medical facilities but those are in the more central areas. Outer Geary is residential with small businesses. I live in the historic residential park neighborhood and you would destroy that history. Remember how the Fillmore was destroyed in the name of urban renewal?

I remember my realtor told me that in SF EVERY block is different. You are taking a sledgehammer to solve a problem that requires more finesse. People come to SF for its distinct neighborhoods and varied charm, not monolithic high rise, high density structures.

Remember, the western part of SF elected you. You are rapidly losing political support with this plan.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christina Shih
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 1:48:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 1:42:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** stephenshilling@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Shilling
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 1:25:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Stephen Shilling
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** noble.angulo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sabine Angulo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 1:25:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sabine Angulo
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** pat.huey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Huey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 1:24:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Patricia Huey
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** erikashe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Shershun
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 1:02:38 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erika Shershun
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** mathias1us@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of marcy israel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 12:51:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am opposed to the upzoning in the neighborhoods proposed. They do not make sense. Along the park? This will not be affordable housing, but park view housing. the excuse of housing on bus lines is absurd, bus lines can adapt to housing. There are many areas of SF that are not developed that could accomadate housing without destroying our neighborhoods and the charm of SF. Height brings wind tunnels, blocks views and impacts negatively.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
marcy israel
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** renitaherrmann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renita Herrmann
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 12:50:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. The lack of a response from other emails I have sent makes me realize my voice is not heard.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Renita Herrmann
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** bkerester@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Kerester
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 12:35:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in San Francisco for 33 years, raised my children in the city, and plan on remaining here for many years to come. My wife and I moved here from New York City and understand, based on experience, the impact of dense neighborhoods and tall buildings.

While I am in favor of upzoning in general and providing more housing throughout the city, I strongly oppose the Mayor's plans to build structures greater than five stories in most neighborhoods except the financial district, which already has tall buildings and need people, and parts of and parts of Van Ness, 19th Street, and Geary Streets, which are wide and are major transportation corridors. The maximum height for buildings in any neighborhood other than the financial district should be five stories along these major transportation corridors. FYI - Chestnut and Union Streets are not transportation corridors; they are narrow streets with stores and housing, and one bus line each.

I have studied the population and geography of the city in detail and calculated the density for the 41 neighborhoods. The upzoning plans focus on building more structures and accommodating more people in some of the most densely populated sections (Marina, Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, North Beach) of the city, which I find unfair to everyone. The average density of these neighborhoods is already 39,571 people per square mile, which is dramatically higher than the city average of 17,107; many neighborhoods have considerably fewer people. These densely populated neighborhoods were built up over the past 100 years and already have numerous buildings which are in excess of 8 stories tall - we do not need more of them. I can send you my spreadsheet, which shows the population and density by 41 neighborhoods.

The city and the real estate developers should focus on building up neighborhoods that are low-density and need people. The city and developers did a great job building out the China Basin and Mission Bay areas. There is plenty of room in the undeveloped neighborhoods to build moderate-height (5-story) buildings. In addition to creating new housing in the city, you need to develop the infrastructure to support it - transportation, police, fire, retail, schools, and parks.

Your plan is a gift to real estate developers. You are not protecting the citizens who live here and made these neighborhoods attractive. Please withdraw your plan, seek citizen input, and develop something that develops the numerous undeveloped areas of San Francisco that desperately need more people and housing.

Thank you,

Brian Kerester

Sincerely,
Brian Kerester
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:52:15 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** ryan.salma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ryan Salma
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:35:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Ryan Salma
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:31:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Senta Tsantilis

**From:** skreamy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Reamy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:27:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Reamy
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** rhanda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhanda Salma
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:26:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rhanda Salma
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** daniellemarone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Danielle Marone
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:25:55 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement !

I am not opposed to buildings that add housing but opposed to buildings that are out of proportion with the scale of the neighborhood.

The outer Sunset does not have the infrastructure to keep up with the large scale buildings that are proposed and it destroys the small community feeling that we cherish.
Please limit new buildings g heights to 5  stories.

Thanks

Sincerely,
Danielle Marone
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:18:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

There is no reason to destroy the character of San Francisco's neighborhoods, whose ongoing vibrancy far surpasses the desolate business terrain downtown. Face it, jobs (except for AI) are not in SF, anywhere but. Make it easier for homeowners, small apartment building owners, and owners of vacant lots to add on units and build using current regulatory height standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** ntlarsen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Niels Larsen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:16:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Niels Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** travelzoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zoe Fuentes
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:16:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Zoe Fuentes
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:02:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

MR. MAYOR AND FRIENDS (YES, I CONSIDER YOU MY FRIENDS) AT CITY HALL -

PLEASE BE WILLING TO SIT DOWN AND SPEAK WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS FROM ALL THE NEIGHBORHOODS TO HEAR THEIR CONCERNS AND SUGGESTIONS TO REACH A MORE NUANCED COMPROMISE APPROACH TO BUILDING MORE HOMES IN SAN FRANCISCO. WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO BUILDING, JUST WANT A MORE MEASURED APPROACH THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT TOPOGRAPHY, HISTORY, LONG-STANDING NEIGHBORHOOD CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE CLOSE-KNIT COMMUNITIES THAT ALREADY EXIST AND THAT ARE THRIVING. THERE IS STILL TIME TO EXAMINE ALTERNATIVES AND OFFER SACRAMENTO ANOTHER SF OPTION THAT LOOKS TO THE FUTURE BY VALUES THE PAST.

RECALCULATE POTENTIAL NUMBERS OF BUILDS POSSIBLE UNDER SUPERVISOR MELGAR'S PREVIOUS LEGISLATION - PARTICULARLY NOW IN LIGHT OF NEW PERMITTING CHANGES. WE CAN STILL GAIN UNITS VIA CORNER OPPORTUNITIES, AND ADUS, AND MORE MIDRISE HEIGTHS WHILE KEEPING EXISTING LEVELS OF VIBRANCY AND OPEN SPACE.
THIS IS WHAT YOUR TAX-BASE CONSTITUENTS WANT TO SEE AND WILL SUPPORT...DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT EXTREME UPZONING.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's CURRENT plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): THERE ARE OPTIONS, REAL ONES. DON'T LOSE THIS OPPORTUNITY, MAYOR, TO BUILD SOLIDARITY WITH ALL YOUR CONSTITUENTS, PARTICULARY THOSE WHO SUPPORT SO MUCH OF YOUR CURRENT WORK TO MAKE SF A MORE SAFE AND VIBRANT PLACE TO LIVE AND WORK, BUT WHO HAVE LEGITIMATE CONCERNS ABOUT THE FAMILY ZONING PLAN YOU ARE PROPOSING.

Sincerely,

Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:50:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:48:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** tab@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Teresa Butler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:41:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Completely misguided plan; thoughtless; destructive.

Sincerely,
Teresa Butler
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Rachael Clausen |
| **To:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | letter in opposition to potential rezoning of height and/or density in west side of San Francisco |
| **Date:** | Monday, September 8, 2025 3:05:50 PM |
| **Attachments:** | San Francisco Planning Department (1).pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Clerk of the Board:
Please provide each district supervisor a copy of the attached letter.

thank you,
Rachael Clausen

September 5, 2025

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, #1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Case No 2021-005878CWP
Board File Nos. 250700 and 250701

Dear Members of the Family Zoning Planning Team – Panning Department:

I am writing as a concerned resident of San Francisco to express my strong opposition to any proposal for “upzoning” in the San Francisco neighborhoods commonly referred to as “the west side of San Francisco.”

These neighborhoods are one of the few remaining parts of San Francisco that maintain a lower-density, residential character with green space, family-oriented homes, and a quieter, more suburban atmosphere. Many of us choose to live here specifically for those qualities, and we are concerned that blanket upzoning would irreversibly damage what makes this community livable.

This area was built to be different from the city’s denser core neighborhoods. Its architectural character, single-family homes, and cohesive layout reflect decades of thoughtful development. That legacy deserves careful stewardship, not sweeping rezoning that treats all neighborhoods as interchangeable.

The residents in the west side of San Francisco are car dependent. Daily necessities like groceries, schools, parks, and services are spread out and not easily accessible by foot or public transit. Adding large multi-unit buildings without dedicated parking will increase the strain on already limited street parking, increase traffic congestion, and worsen pedestrian safety, especially in neighborhoods and streets not built to support higher traffic volumes.

Other major cities understand that not all neighborhoods are appropriate for high-density development. In New York City, for example, most large-scale development is concentrated in Manhattan, where infrastructure and transit systems can support it, not in Staten Island, the Bronx, or the residential parts of Brooklyn, which are also part of New York City. San Francisco should take a similarly balanced approach. Just because state law mandates more housing doesn't mean every neighborhood must absorb the same burden, especially areas in the west side of the City that lack the infrastructure and transit to support it responsibly.

What is especially troubling is that the upzoning maps focus almost entirely on the working and middle-class neighborhoods on the west side of the City, excluding major residential areas in Presidio Heights, St. Francis Wood, Forest

Hill, Goldengate Heights, Noe Valey, the Bayview and South of Market. If the goal is truly about equitable housing policy, why are only certain neighborhoods being asked to shoulder the weight of this change? This selective targeting suggests a process shaped more by politics and convenience than by fairness or smart planning.

We also have to ask: who is this housing actually for? Many younger San Franciscans and new arrivals are not looking to live in the proposed upzoning areas. They prefer vibrant, walkable neighborhoods like the Mission, Bernal Heights, Noe Valley or Hayes Valley, areas with better transit access and more cultural life. The west side of San Francisco does not offer that kind of lifestyle. There is a very real risk that upzoning here will lead to units that sit vacant or are priced far out of reach. With an estimated 60,000 vacant units already in San Francisco, simply building more housing, especially at market rate, will not address the real issue: affordability**.**

I also want to speak to the increasingly common tactic of labeling any community concern as "NIMBYism." That is not what this is. We are not opposed to housing; we are opposed to poorly planned, inequitable, developer-driven policies that ignore local context and livability. Just because we oppose upzoning *here* does not mean we oppose progress. We simply want policies that are fair, thoughtful, and serve the people who need housing most. Our neighborhoods should not be sacrificed in the name of "progress" defined by large developers with deep pockets and political access. We ask you, as the oversight body, to represent San Franciscans, not special interest groups.

Meanwhile, our infrastructure cannot support major increases in density. Public transit is limited. Roads, sewers, and emergency services are already strained. Local schools may not have capacity. Adding hundreds or thousands of units without matching investment in basic infrastructure and public services is not sustainable, and it puts everyone, current and future residents alike, at risk.

San Francisco needs to grow, but it must grow *wisely*. Upzoning should be targeted, infrastructure-aware, and community-informed. I respectfully urge you to oppose any blanket upzoning in the west side of San Francisco unless it is part of a broader, equitable, and sustainable citywide plan that prioritizes affordability, infrastructure investment, and true community engagement.

Sincerely,

Rachael Clausen
Parkside resident

cc: Board of Supervisors – via electronic mail

**From:** patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 5:18:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson

**From:** sfgoldsmith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Goldsmith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:51:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This plan is not affordability, it is a redevelopment plan selling off our city to the highest bidder at the expense of working people, rent controlled residents, and families. This plan incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacing renters and our cherished small businesses, and the crass transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. How can this plan claim to serve families when it does not meaningfully set conditions for affordability? How can this plan claim to serve the generations of San Franciscans to come when it incentivizes demolition? This plan offers no solution for our current catastrophic vacancy rate, no scalability of the infrastructure needed to support increases in density across our city, and doesn't even acknowledge our current trend of population decline. Peer cities have bought into blanket upzoning - Vancouver, Austin, Manhattan, Hong Kong - and presented a cautionary tale. Trickle down economics doesn't work, and neither does this plan masquerading as abundance. This is not a matter of simple supply and demand - our equity driven market demands complex solutions centering everyday San Franciscans like the constituents you serve.

I call on you as a San Franciscan who wants to build a family, send my kids to SFUSD, and live my life in our great city to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

How can you claim to serve our city when you support a plan our greatest neighborhood organizations, housing advocates, and small business owners unanimously oppose? Do better by our city, and do better by yourself by doing the right thing and scaling back this map and taking the time needed to craft a viable plan with community support.

Sincerely,
Sarah Goldsmith
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mmueller5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Mueller
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:42:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident of district 2, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

San Francisco doesn't have the transportation infrastructure to support the increased density (a single bus route on a surface street is not credible mass transit). The upzoning will result in a massive increase in land values, which means that developers will be forced to build maximum height limit buildings to make the economics work, with no concern for which buildings will be replaced or how the neighbors and neighborhoods close to the proposed building will be impacted. This plan needs to be dramatically curtailed, particularly in the north and western parts of the city which cannot take the increased density.

Sincerely,
Michael Mueller

**From:** Roger Weinman
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:42:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Roger

Roger
California

**From:** abdkl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Little
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:31:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To all San Francisco Board of Supervisors -and- Mayor Laurie
PLEASE listen to your constituents. Proposition K was and remains a disaster. The traffic nightmare that the Sunset & Parkside and Outer Sunset has become for us residents a constant pain. Nineteenth Avenue, part of the 280 route to the Golden Gate Bridge is constantly busy. The California coastal economy is constantly impacted. Peninsula and Marin coastal commuters, even not counting S.F. residents, now have an unneeded half hour added to their daily commute.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
David Little
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:01:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:00:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** sternc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claudia Stern
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 12:32:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have lived and voted in San Francisco since 1985. I am appalled at the development plan currently under consideration by the Planning Commission. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Claudia Stern
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** peter.yedidia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Yedidia
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 12:12:18 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I've lived in San Francisco for 50 years and now reside in North Beach.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Peter Yedidia
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** theodora.m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Theodora Manty
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 12:08:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I think it's awful that those of us who would be impacted by this were not invited to meetings to learn about this plan. When I voted for Lurie, I thought I was voting for someone who really had our interests at heart. I see he, in some way, is taking a page from the President's book and trying to pull a fast one on us! Why didn't the Mayor come to our neighborhood association meetings to talk to us? Our supervisor, Myrna Melgar is in cahoots with him as she ignores her constituents. She does have a representative from her office attend our meetings, but he can't answer all of our questions and address our concerns. She is the one who can! Oh well, this is the present state of our federal and local governing bodies.
Theodora Manty

Sincerely,
Theodora Manty
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** esinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eihway Su
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 10:41:15 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eihway Su
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** meeshell1943@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michelle Welch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 9:10:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michelle Welch
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** knit1purl1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 7:11:55 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

It's very important to preserve San Francisco's uniqueness. Turning it into Manhattan is not only unnecessary but it would destroy the city, if seismic issues don't destroy oversized buildings first. I was born in San Francisco and am shocked to see that San Francisco born mayors such as London Breed and Daniel Lurie do not understand the uniqueness of their home city. If this new redevelopment scheme happens, history will show it to be a tremendous mistake.

Sincerely,
PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 4:18:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** THE_DREADNOUGHT@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JEFFREY RICKER
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 11:33:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

SF residents do not want to be force fed Wienertopia from Sacramento!

Sincerely,
JEFFREY RICKER
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** h.weiner@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Herbert Weiner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 10:19:12 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Herbert Weiner
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** soaring_leap@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Meredith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 9:49:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose massive upzoning, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes; displacement of renters, longtime homeowners and small businesses; and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Golden Gate Park shouldn't become Central Park.

We need affordable housing but we sure don't need or want luxury units in super tall buildings that ruin our neighborhood vibe.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back and scale downwards ! the upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lauren Meredith
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** alantor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Allen Lantor
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 8:09:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: These plans will ruin the present fabric and essence of the neighborhoods and neighborhood business communities that make San Francisco special and a desired place to live, as well as a desired destination for tourists to visit. These plans are not the right approach to address the problem you are attempting to resolve. Ruined neighborhoods, destruction of local businesses, increased congestion, higher crime, and stressed infrastructure will be the result. Please vote against the upzoning plans. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Allen Lantor
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** lori.ottolini.geno@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margret Geno
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 8:01:47 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Why this is a poorly conceived plan:
1. Infrastructure feasibility, systems and infrastructure cannot sustain this type of density - feasibility study was limited
2. Actual Growth of the city does not reflect the nature of this project.
3. The lack of neighborhood oversight
4. Loss of Neighborhood integrity.

Sincerely,
Margret Geno
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Hoegger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 7:54:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (we have abundant open space in Visitation Valley and along 3rd St which has a new light rail , ideal for commuters.. The east side is loaded with abundant and deteriorating industrial sites.unlike the westside.
As a 45 year real estate broker I assure you increasing the supply of market rate housing which Wii be a result of the zoning changes will not address the real housing problem which is affordability. Contractors are not incentivized to build low cost housing on sites they pay for at market rate. The old construction axiom has been "it costs the same to drive a nail in a shed as it does in a mansion." We ask you to not contribute to the demise of SF's unique village character.
Ken and Kathy Hoegger, SF Proud Natives

Sincerely,
Ken Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of N P
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 7:52:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
N P

**From:** khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joseph Hoegger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 7:37:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Joseph Hoegger

**From:** francesschreiberg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Schreiberg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 6:58:17 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan living on the same block in North Beach since 1976 and having raised my daughter here, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. It, or earlier legislation, will also permit a building of some 24 stories at the bottom of my block which will seriously impact my 2 tenants who will leave my building - and whose rent I depend on in retirement to pay my mortgage, property tax, and insurance. This is what I depend on in my retirement.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The proposed changes to upzone North Beach / Telegraph Hill do not impact me directly as I'm already adversely affected by earlier legislation that increased height and density. But it will impact my neighbors, many who are also small property owners, who will lose tenants during 2 - 3 years of construction which one reasonably should anticipate when you upzone this historic neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Frances Schreiberg
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** lwb6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Butler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 6:49:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carolyn Butler

**From:** askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 6:12:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Polesky
San Francisco, CA 94107

**From:** carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of carol clark
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 5:46:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
carol clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** christyoconnell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christy O"Connell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 5:24:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan for almost twenty-four years, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christy O'Connell
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Mitch Conquer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 5:14:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Mitch Conquer
mitchconquer@gmail.com
77a Pearl Street
San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 4:39:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please vote against this extreme measure that will change the Victorian neighborhoods forever!!

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** v.barker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Virginia Barker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 4:34:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The plan is destructive of Rent Control. Rent Control is the largest, most successful housing affordability plan the City has. It is essential to maintaining a diverse city economy and culture. Yet, the City plans to destroy Rent Control in the name of housing affordability - for the rich. The plan should be named Mayor Lurie's Let Them Eat Cake Upzoning. The tenant "protections" are risable. The Plan is a betrayal of San Franciscans, most of whom have relied for nearly half a century on the City's fair and effective Rent Control protection. It will damage the lives and livelihoods - of your constituents!

Sincerely,
Virginia Barker
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kcodysf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kate McCaffrey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 4:08:18 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am a native San Franciscan. I have lived in the Sunset/Parkside district my whole life. This plan would destroy my beloved neighborhood. Please take action against this!

Sincerely,
Kate McCaffrey
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** jvspangenberg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Spangenberg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 3:36:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
These changes will also not be felt evenly - some neighborhoods such as Sea Cliff, Presidio Heights, Marina will feel less effect. The Outer Richmond where I live (between Geary & Clement) would be heavily impacted. This is not a fair application of sharing the burden, and hence the effect on home values. This will make the homes of the wealthiest home owners located in less impacted neighborhoods increase in value while impacted homes will be less valuable, exacerbating wealth disparity. Some corridors such as Geary make sense if transit improvements follow (and primarily, transit has to be SAFE, EFFICIENT & CLEAN if residents are to use it). Outer Clement does not make sense, nor do the streets between the major arteries.

Sincerely,
Jill Spangenberg
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** informationmistress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of lori higa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 3:33:59 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I've been a homeowner & resident in San Francisco for over 35 years, living in the Russian Hill, Sunset district & now SoMa neighborhoods. Please prioritize the needs of your constituents overvdevelopers. Don't destroy the charm, history & character of all of SF's wonderful neighborhoods with half baked development legislation & ideas in reaction to the affordability crisis in our town without preserving what is loved.

Sincerely,
lori higa
San Francisco, CA 94103

**From:** birker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Birke Reimnitz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 3:24:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This is NOT for the good of the city! This will destroy the character of this city!

Sincerely,
Birke Reimnitz
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** kayechandley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kaye Handley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 3:15:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My husband and I recently moved to San Francisco, a place we have long loved for its charm and beauty. Despite the city's tarnished image and crime in areas around Union Square, we decided to buy here and now have a home in Cow Hollow. WE ARE VERY CONCERNED about plans to build up neighborhoods around the city with high rises that will increase density and destroy the charm of the city we chose.
As former residents of New York City we know what high rises and increased density do to a neighborhood of local restaurants and shopkeepers. And to the beauty of the city. We don't need that here.
This will do nothing to alleviate homelessness. This is not affordable housing for low-income residents. DON'T DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOODS on the false promise of helping the homeless.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Kaye Handley
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** alecd69@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alec Davis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 3:15:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alec Davis
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** khoegger2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joseph Hoegger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, September 8, 2025 3:05:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadliney

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

As a 45 year real estate broker, my experience of the San Francisco market is that increasing the supply of upscale units that would make up the majority of additions that would be allowed under the zoning changes being proposed WOULD NOT BRING DOWN PRICES. We do not need more housing, we need AFFORDABLE HOUSING.
We need a mix of market and affordable housing in areas like the Brisbane Visitation Valley areas where estimations of 30,000+ units have been projected. The Bay View 3rd Street corridor is ideal for large scale development with aging warehouses along with a new 3rd Street light rail. A new trans bay tunnel has been proposed.
Many westside zoning change advocates promote new zoning as a way to bring the westside into housing balance with the eastside. Is it not more desirable to enhance eastside neighborhoods by ridding them of abandoned and crumbling industrial buildings?
We have the land to meet the goals of the state housing element, let's not destroy our village like character that exists in our neighborhoods. I always felt proud to be a San Francisco native when New Yorkers observed our neighborhoods to be a conglomeration of villages.

Sincerely,
Joseph Hoegger
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Andrew Robinson |
| **To:** | CPC-Commissions Secretary; Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | SUPPORT-Family Zoning |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, September 10, 2025 5:54:16 PM |
| **Attachments:** | SUPPORT- Family Zoning_The East Cut_09.09.25.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,
On behalf of The East Cut Community Benefit District, please find attached our letter of support for approval of the Family Zoning Plan.

Sincerely,
Andrew

--

The East Cut Community Benefit District | 528 Folsom Street | San Francisco, CA 94105
O: 415.543.8223 | C: 415.891.7302 | theeastcut.org | instagram.com/theeastcut

# THE EAST CUT

September 9, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Support for San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of The East Cut Community Benefit District (CBD), I write to express our strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. The East Cut is home to a flourishing residential community, thousands of workers, and a growing network of small businesses. Our experience has shown that vibrant cities rely on a healthy balance of housing, commerce, and public space. The Family Zoning Plan moves us closer to that balance.

Housing Growth Supports Neighborhood Vitality
San Francisco continues to face an acute housing shortage that threatens the stability of families, the competitiveness of our workforce, and the strength of our neighborhood economies. By expanding opportunities for family-sized and mid-rise housing in more neighborhoods, the Family Zoning Plan will make it possible for more workers and families to live in San Francisco. With housing growth projected to generate nearly $5.6 billion in local spending, this plan also strengthens the retail and service industries that are critical to thriving communities.

Protecting and Supporting Small Businesses
The Family Zoning Plan rightly prioritizes development on underutilized lots, such as parking lots, gas stations, or vacant buildings, preserving existing storefronts wherever possible. In those rare cases where relocation is necessary, the plan provides thoughtful protections, including early notification, relocation assistance, waived permit fees, and incentives to retain or incorporate legacy and community-serving businesses into new projects. These safeguards ensure that housing growth strengthens rather than undermines our small business ecosystem.

Shared Responsibility Across the City
For too long, a limited set of neighborhoods have stepped forward to increase our city's housing stock, making room for people across the economic spectrum, while others have remained off-limits. The Family Zoning Plan takes a more balanced, citywide approach, distributing housing opportunities more

528 Folsom Street
San Francisco
CA 94105

415.543.8223
info@theeastcut.org
theeastcut.org

fairly across San Francisco. This not only advances equity but also protects the city's eligibility for vital state housing and infrastructure funding.

**A Stronger San Francisco for Families and Workers**
The East Cut CBD strongly believes that San Francisco's future depends on making our neighborhoods places where people can both live and work. The Family Zoning Plan is an important step toward that future. By advancing this plan, the City will retain talent, stabilize communities, strengthen small businesses, and build a more inclusive, resilient economy.

expediently.
Sincerely,

Andrew Robinson
Executive Director, on behalf of
The East Cut Community Benefit District Board of Directors

**From:** Simone Alberti
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:00:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Build, build, build!

Simone Alberti
simo.alb88@gmail.com
131 Noe St.
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** nhf009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Fee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:22:40 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San Franciscan and a Russian Hill resident of 30 years, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- At a minimum, follow the thoughtful and entirely reasonable recommendations of San Francisco's 50+ year historic preservation organization, SF Heritage:
    1. Exclude all category A parcels in the proposed upzoning area
    2. Tie completion of the SF Survey and the subsequent designation of qualifying landmarks and historic districts to a clear and specific timeline in the zoning plan
    3. Execute a complete and total revision of the Planning Department's Historic Preservation program including a reassessment of strategy and shared goals among constituents and elected leaders.

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Protect, don't destroy our special places, built environment and urban culture.

Sincerely,
Nancy Fee

**From:** tracyclagett@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of E. T. Clagett
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:59:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a forty-year resident of Ingleside Terraces,I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I have written to you previously describing the potentially perilous my residential property is in under this plan.

I fully agree with the following concise statement: Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

If these plans are brought to full fruition--over a period of years--San Francisco will be a city inhabited only by the wealthy and the poor. Families do not want to live in--or surrounded by--highrise multi-unit buildings, and all middle -lass families who can manage to leave the city will do so.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I call upon you not to adopt this destructive plan for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
E. T. Clagett
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:52:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

These upzoning plans are hiding behind the state's requirements to build affordable additional housing. Instead, the plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The number of units San Francisco is required to plan for keeps changing and our Planning Department refuses to show their math or offer alternative plans. Mayor Lurie, and his way too powerful but inexperienced housing chief Ned Segal, have not pushed back on lobbyist demands because they don't understand the math or loopholes, while developers and their own planning department run circles around them.

It is presented as accepted fact that this flawed plan is all we have, and everyone must fall in line. No discussion; no proof; no debate allowed.

Again, I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Gladys Soto
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:07:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Gladys Soto
gladysholdersoto@gmail.com
218 Genebern Way
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** Mark Holmquist
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 6:43:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

Though I'm unfortunately traveling for work and won't be able to attend tomorrow's commission hearing, I'm writing to express my strongest support for the Family Zoning Plan. I've been following this legislation with rapt attention for quite some time, in its various iterations. Since I moved to the city 15 years ago, housing has been such a fraught topic--the source of so much financial stress and difficulty for so many people living here--myself included. I've watched so many people give up and leave, not because they wanted to, but because they felt they didn't have a choice.

The ONLY way this will ever get better is to reduce the myriad bureaucratic sources of friction and incentivize and enable the construction of as much housing as possible, reasonably located in transportation and retail corridors . We need to push back against the engrained, privileged (and tone-deaf) voice of the NIMBYs who have ruled this city for far too long.

This is also one of many steps we need to take to expedite the cultural reawakening of our city--to attract and bring back the youth, the artists, the drivers of activity that will breathe fresh life back into every corner of SF.

I'm so proud of our city for bringing this to the table, for making it happen. Let's get it over the finish line and watch our city start its next chapter. Thank you for doing your part!

Mark Holmquist

Mark Holmquist
markfb9@gmail.com
549 Duncan St
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 6:14:49 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please don't ruin our neighborhoods!

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stan Hayes |
| **To:** | So, Lydia (CPC) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); rachel.tanner@sfgov.org; Chen, Lisa (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); nancy Shanahan |
| **Subject:** | OPPOSITION - Proposed Family Zoning Plan (2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP) |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, September 9, 2025 6:26:07 PM |
| **Attachments:** | THD Com Ltr_CPC_Upzoning Plan_FINAL 9-9-25.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear President So and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly **OPPOSE** the above-cited Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan. Please accept the attached letter as THD's initial comments on the Plan.

For the reasons set forth in our letter, the Mayor's Zoning Plan is inconsistent with the approved Housing Element, resulting in new major impacts not considered in the FEIR.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and Office of the Mayor to remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and Northern Waterfront areas from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan

Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

September 9, 2025

Lydia So, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
49 S. Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
*Via email:* commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

**RE: OPPOSITION to Proposed Family Zoning Plan (2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP)**
Items 14(a), 14(b) and 14(c): General Plan Amendments; Planning Code Text Amendments; and Zoning Map Amendments

Dear President So and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly **OPPOSE** the Mayor's proposed Family Zoning Plan ("Mayor's Zoning Plan"), specifically the inclusion in the Mayor's Zoning Plan of major portions of Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront which were not in the 2022 Adopted Housing Element ("Housing Element") nor were the resulting new impacts considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

For more than seventy years, since 1954, THD has worked hard to build, maintain, and celebrate the vitality, livability and sustainability of some of San Francisco's most cherished neighborhoods. We have embraced a vision of housing growth that prioritizes affordable housing while fully protecting our existing tenants, vibrant small businesses, historic resources, and diverse culture of District 3, safeguarding the soul, vitality, and vibrancy of our densely developed neighborhood. Now the Mayor's Zoning Plan puts all of that at risk.

As set forth below, the Mayor's Zoning Plan is inconsistent with the approved Housing Element, resulting in new major impacts not considered in the FEIR.

1. **Remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northern Waterfront, including Fisherman's Wharf from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.**

In mid-2025, Mayor Lurie proposed a Draft Upzoning Plan that for the first time included proposed height increases and density decontrols in the North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and Northern Waterfront areas, which had not been included in any of the previously proposed Upzoning Maps. Most notably, these changes were not in the *"Proposed Action"* analyzed in the adopted and certified FEIR, nor were they included on any of the "*Rezoning Program Scenarios*" contained in the adopted Updated 2022 Housing Element ("Housing Element"). And, every figure considered in the FEIR, including for example the possible future consideration of a Housing Sustainability District, specifically excluded these areas.

As revealed in the proposed Addendum to the FEIR, although the Housing Element and FEIR assumed and considered that the Northeast Planning District would provide net new housing units of only *800 units*, the Mayor's Zoning Plan now proposes *5,900 units*, a stunning *650% increase*. The proposed major height increases and density decontrol in the Mayor's Zoning Plan to accommodate this increase would have significant additional impacts on existing tenants,

small businesses, historic resources, parks and open spaces, and the diverse culture of District 3 that were never considered during the extensive public process leading up the adoption of the Housing Element.

Further, most of the areas in North Beach and the Northern Waterfront area now shown as being added to Mayor's Zoning Plan are within the *Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District*, which the Housing Element and FEIR assumed would not be within the areas to be upzoned or density decontrolled.

We have learned from discussions with individuals in the Planning Department, confirmed by emails obtained through a Sunshine Act Request, that the addition to the Mayor's Zoning Plan of these sensitive areas of District 3 was done with the specific approval of District 3 Supervisor, Danny Sauter. We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and Office of the Mayor to remove North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and Northern Waterfront areas from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

## 2. Major Impacts to District 3 Neighborhoods Not Addressed in the FEIR

The Mayor's Zoning Plan would imperil our neighborhood's existing rent-controlled, multi-unit family housing, ethnic diversity, historic and cultural resources, parks, and economic vibrancy of our small neighborhood businesses. Moreover, it would encourage speculation and set up conditions that would have adverse social and economic effects on our neighborhoods. As pointed out below, such impacts are in direct conflict with the adopted Housing Element.

### Significant New Threats to Existing Tenants and Rent-Controlled Housing

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are among the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco, with roughly 82% of our residents living in existing pre-1979 multi-family, rent-controlled buildings that house our City's workforce and seniors, including a large immigrant Asian population. Based on the City's profiles of neighborhoods in San Francisco, there are **37,156** people per square mile in North Beach as compared to **17,325** people per square mile in San Francisco.[1] The Planning Department's own maps show that rent-controlled buildings in District 3 (built before 1979 with 2+ units, excluding condos) represent approximately **32,336** units. And data collected by the SF Anti-Displacement Coalition and the SF Rent Board shows that, as a result of the Ellis Act, owner move-ins, buy-outs, and other no-fault evictions, many of our most vulnerable seniors and low-income tenants have already been displaced by speculators who turned their former homes into TICs and condominiums, often merging units for increased profits.

The Mayor's Zoning Plan, with its proposed upzoning and density decontrol in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, would further increase property values in these neighborhoods resulting in even greater speculation, demolitions, and displacement of our tenant population, which is in direct conflict with the Housing Element. Section 2 of the Housing Element: "Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing" acknowledges these threats:

[1] https://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/North-Beach-San-Francisco-CA.html

> *"Tenants often face greater housing precarity because they do not own their own homes and are more likely than homeowners to be lower income, face high housing cost burdens, and are often at greater risk of displacement. A majority of San Francisco residents are tenants, so tenant stability is often key to stabilizing communities."*

Existing legal protections for tenants have not prevented evictions, nor will the so-called "tenant protections" for rent-controlled buildings contained in the legislation enacting the Mayor's Zoning Plan prevent the flood of displacement incentivized by the proposed upzoning and density decontrol in District 3. Incentives for redevelopment provided by the upzoning and density decontrol, along with deregulation, will intensify demolition and displacement, destabilizing our communities. This creates long-term blight as properties become vacant, and developers dither because of outside factors like financing and adverse market conditions. Displaced tenants will be unable to afford the new units, even in the very low number of so-called "affordable units" assumed in the Mayor's Zoning Plan, and will disappear from our neighborhood.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove from the proposed Draft Upzoning Plan all height increases and density decontrols from existing multi-family, rent-controlled housing. The density of pre-1979 rent controlled units is the reason North Beach was never, until now, a part of the *"Proposed Action"* in the adopted and certified 2022 Housing Element EIR.

**Significant New Impacts to Small Businesses**

Columbus Avenue and Union and Powell Streets are part of the economic and cultural anchors of North Beach. Our small-scale retail corridors, where many are individually listed as Legacy Businesses, support hundreds of jobs, contribute significantly to the economic vibrancy and livability of our neighborhood, and are integral to the tourism industry that further contributes to supporting local employment and small businesses.

Importantly, the Housing Element does not call for upzoning or density decontrol of any of the retail corridors in North Beach, nor did it call for upzoning on Lombard, North Point, Beach, Jefferson, Chestnut, Francisco, or Bay Streets. None of the North Beach or Northern Waterfront retail corridors now shown in the Mayor's Zoning Plan were considered or analyzed in the adopted FEIR.

As stated in a joint letter to Mayor Lurie from multiple Westside and Northern neighborhood business leaders, including many from North Beach:

> *"Despite being labeled "family zoning," the plan will not deliver affordable housing for working families or protect small, family-run businesses. Instead, it threatens to displace workers, shutter long-standing neighborhood institutions, and hand over our communities to speculative development.*
>
> *"Already, parcels are being acquired and storefronts left vacant in anticipation of redevelopment. Our neighborhood businesses—still recovering from the pandemic, debt,*

> *and rising costs—cannot survive without stronger protections. The proposed upzoning, which allows 6–14+ story projects to replace century-old, three-story buildings, would overwhelm narrow streets, strain emergency services, and force closures of businesses that have served San Francisco for generations."*

Although the Mayor's Zoning Plan offers developers height increases and additional density in return for agreeing to locate displaced businesses in their proposed developments, we are aware that the ground floors of many new large apartment and condominium buildings are mostly vacant – look at those on Market Street or other corridors like Van Ness Avenue.

In District 3, the experience of The Jug Shop, a 60-year-old Legacy Business on Pacific Avenue at Polk Street foretells the future of our small businesses resulting from the Mayor's Zoning Plan. The Jug Shop was displaced and its home demolished to make way for a large-scale market-rate condominium development. The Jug Shop temporarily relocated a block away, hoping to return to the ground floor of the new condominium building on the site of its former long-time home. Unable to afford the build-out on the ground floor of the new building, it was forced to go out of business after 60 years of continuous operation. This will be the model for District 3 going forward if the proposed upzoning is adopted.

Upzoning these corridors would trigger redevelopment that almost always begins with demolition and displacement of small businesses. Like The Jug Shop, absent legal protections, displaced businesses would not survive the transition. Additionally, adjacent businesses are often dragged down by years of construction-related disruption. Noise, fencing, blocked sidewalks, lost parking, and reduced foot traffic can destabilize commercial blocks. The result is not affordable housing—it is the slow erosion of the vitality and street life, and the interconnectivity of the community, that make our neighborhoods work.

Furthermore, upzoning and density decontrol on commercial corridors in District 3 would increase property values and lead to commercial rent increases, forcing out many small businesses that are thriving economically under the existing zoning. The upscale commercialization of our neighborhood will never lead to more affordable housing.

<u>We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove North Beach and its thriving neighborhood commercial corridors from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.</u> They were never a part of the Housing Element, never appeared in any prior upzoning maps and were not considered part of the *"Proposed Action"* in the adopted and certified FEIR.

**Significant New Impacts to Historic Resources**

North Beach and Telegraph Hill are among the oldest and most significant historic neighborhoods in San Francisco. The Telegraph Hill Historic District, filled with survivors of the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, is one of the earliest historic districts designated under Planning Code Article 10. A fully documented proposed North Beach National Register Historic District, which the Mayor and Supervisor Sauter have thus far refused to support, clearly qualifies for recognition on the California and National Registers of Historic Places. The Washington Square Historic District, The Powell Street Shops Historic District, and the Upper Grant Avenue Historic

District are recognized by the City Planning Department as eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources. Washington Square is San Francisco Landmark No. 226. The Northern Waterfront contains at least seven Article 10 landmarks and National Register listed buildings. In addition, surveys of North Beach and the Planning Department's maps show hundreds more "A-Rated Buildings" in District 3.

As these areas were not included in the Housing Element, the addition of these historic areas to in the Mayor's Zoning Plan would threaten historic sites and districts with potential demolition and redevelopment, potentially significant additional impacts not analyzed in the FEIR. An Addendum to the FEIR is not a substitute for analysis of additional impacts from a changed project.

Attached to the Addendum to the FEIR is *Appendix D, Memorandum Regarding Potential Zoning Map Changes In Supervisor District 3*, which proports to use the FEIR and the Addendum to the FEIR as a substitute for environmental review in anticipation of adding even more development to the Mayor's Zoning Plan, by changing the base density of significant areas within the Article 10 Northeast Waterfront Historic District along Sansome Street to form-based density. Layering a State Density Bonus on form-based density within this historic district would allow building heights to be supercharged upward to as high as 200-300 feet (as demonstrated by proposed buildings at 950 and 1088 Sansome). This increase in development intensity is of particular environmental impact concern given the high frequency and severity of landslides in that area. This addition to the Mayor's Zoning Plan is clearly a major impact that has not been analyzed in the FEIR.

To illuminate the disparities between the Housing Element and the Mayor's Zoning Plan, we share the following actions contained in the Housing Element which specifically provide for the designation and promotion of historic districts:

> *"4.5.5 <u>Designate historically and culturally significant buildings, landscapes, and districts for preservation using</u> the Citywide Cultural Resource Survey, Planning Code Articles 10 and 11, <u>and state and national historic resource registries to ensure appropriate treatment of historic properties that are important to the community</u>. . .and to unlock historic preservation incentives for more potential housing development sites."*
>
> *"4.5.8 Promote historic preservation and cultural heritage incentives, such as tax credit programs and the State Historical Building Code, for use in residential rehabilitation projects through general outreach, interagency collaboration with MOHCD and OEWD, building trades collaboration, educational materials, community capacity building efforts, and the regulatory review process."*

In conflict with the above provisions of the Housing Element, there is no provision in the Mayor's Zoning Plan to provide protections for historic buildings, and there are no historic preservation incentives, such as making available tax credit programs, the Mills Act property tax reduction, or the State Historical Building Code, for use in residential rehabilitation projects. Further, the Mayor and Supervisor Sauter have continued to thwart the designation of the North Beach National Register Historic District.

The protection of cultural assets and historic resources is a legitimate exercise of the City's police powers and the City's ability to protect historic resources is a well settled legal principle. The failure to include such protections in the Mayor's Zoning Plan is a choice to intensify threats of demolition of our City's cultural assets and historic resources important to our communities. These protections must be added to the Mayor's Zoning Plan.

We urge the Planning Commission to recommend the addition of protections and incentives for the preservation of historic properties, and to urge the Mayor and Supervisor Sauter to join with local businesses, organizations, residents, and property owners in support of the designation of the proposed North Beach National Register Historic District.

**New Shadow Impacts to Parks and Open Spaces in North Beach**

North Beach is among the areas of the City with the greatest density and the least amount of parks and open space per person with only two well-used parks – Joe DiMaggio Playground and Washington Square (Landmark No. 226) – both under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. In addition to these parks, Levi's Plaza Park, a private open space bounded by The Embarcadero and Battery Street, designed by renowned landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, is proposed to be changed to form-based density by Mayor's Zoning Plan. The additional impacts to these parks and open spaces were not analyzed in the FEIR.

The Mayor's Zoning Plan proposes to upzone up to 65 feet (from the existing height limit of 40 feet) parcels surrounding Joe DiMaggio Playground for projects using the Housing Choice local program. While State Density Bonus projects could be as high as 2 times the current height limit, or 80 feet (8 stories), a change to form-based density could allow even greater heights. This would also be the case for parcels surrounding Washington Square Park.

Because Joe DiMaggio Playground and the landmarked Washington Square are under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, they are protected by a voter-approved Planning Code amendment restricting the construction of any structure exceeding forty feet in height that would cast a shadow that is adverse to the use of the park from between one hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset. Because of the small size and location of Washington Square, it has been determined that it can tolerate no new shadow. In addition, any new shadow on Washington Square must be assessed for its impact on an Article 10 Landmark site.

Since the area including North Beach, Telegraph Hill and the Northern Waterfront was not proposed for upzoning in the Housing Element, the FEIR did not assess the additional shadow impacts on parks and open spaces in the areas added by the Mayor's Zoning Plan, including but not limited to Washington Square, Joe DiMaggio Playground, and the Levi Plaza Park.

**Significant New Impacts on the Northern Waterfront**

For more than 60 years, the northern portion of District 3, nearest to the waterfront, has been zoned at a maximum height of 40 feet. The Mayor's Zoning Plan proposes increasing those heights to 65 and 85 feet, along with density decontrol. Layering a State Density Bonus on density decontrol could supercharge building heights upward to much higher than 85 feet.

The effect of this layering can be seen for a proposed nearby building at 955 Sansome. Currently zoned to a maximum height of 84 feet, by layering a State Density Bonus and density decontrol, the proposed building is nearly 300 feet in height. For reference, this is more than three times the zoned height limit, more than three times taller than the tallest building in the Northeast Waterfront Historic District in which it is located, and even taller than Telegraph Hill itself.

If the upzoning to 85 feet proposed between Bay Street and Beach Street is adopted, buildings, such as that proposed at 955 Sansome almost certainly would be built, creating a new wall on the waterfront, which was soundly rejected by San Francisco voters in 2013, and by a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors last year.

Also, the 2022 Housing Element Update identifies significant portions of the Northern Waterfront as earthquake *Liquefaction Hazard Zones* (see Figure 4.1-26, Liquefaction Hazards). Since none of that area was proposed for upzoning in the Housing Element, the FEIR did not assess earthquake liquefaction impacts in that area and their potential significance. However, the Mayor's Zoning Plan extended upzoning to portions of the Northern Waterfront that are within the *Liquefaction Hazard Zones*. As such, analysis of liquefaction hazard impacts must be done.

We further call your attention to the fact that the area being upzoned on the Northern Waterfront is within the *Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District* and outside of the Well-Resourced Neighborhoods that are the focus of the Housing Element. It appears this area was included to provide incentives for developers to build large market-rate housing with bay views, offering significant profit.

<u>We urge the Planning Commission to require the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove the Northern Waterfront from the Mayor's Zoning Plan.</u>

3. **The RHNA Mandate to Build Affordable Housing Is Overstated in the Proposed Upzoning Plan**

The 2022 Housing Element update was adopted to promote the construction of housing units to meet San Francisco's 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) that mandates the creation of more than 82,000 units within the city, requiring that 47,000 or 57% of the 82,000 units be affordable by extremely low income, very low income, low income, or moderate-income groups.

The RHNA mandate, however, is based on outdated high-growth population projections that no longer apply. We note that the State's Department of Finance now forecasts that in 2030, and even in 2050, thousands <u>fewer</u> people will live in San Francisco than in 2020. Why, then, are we letting Sacramento push us into an 82,000-unit RHNA mandate?

In conflict with the adopted Housing Element, the Mayor's Zoning Plan overstates the RHNA mandates to build or preserve affordable housing. Moreover, the numerous new State (and local) housing laws enacted since the adoption of the Housing Element and certification of Housing Element FEIR have already vastly reduced the constraints on development of market-rate housing, making it even more difficult, if not impossible, for the RHNA affordable housing mandates to be met. The effect of these new State and local laws represent a change in circumstance that was not taken into consideration in the FEIR.

We urge the Planning Commission to ask that the Planning Department and the Mayor's office revisit the RHNA mandate to better match updated population projections. Please explain why the proposed upzoning plan has no meaningful provision to provide for the affordable housing that the RHNA mandate is predicated on. And, if the currently proposed SB 79 passes, is there any need to upzone?

**4. Incorporate by Reference REP Letter**

We wish to incorporate by reference the conclusions, recommendations and strategies contained in the letter dated September 4, 2025, to Planning Commission from Race & Equity in All Planning Coalition (REP-SF).

* * * * * * * *

In conclusion, we urge the Planning Commission to recommend to the Planning Department and the Mayor's office to remove Telegraph Hill, North Beach, and the Northern Waterfront from the Mayor's Zoning Plan consistent with the 2022 Housing Element.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan

Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie daniel.lurie@sfgov.org
Supervisor Danny Sauter danny.sauter@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Director of Planning sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachel Tanner, Director, Citywide Planning rachel.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Lydia So, President lydia.so@sfgov.org
Kathrin Moore, Vice President kathrin.moore@sfgov.org
Theresa Imperial, Commissioner theresa.imperial@sfgov.org
Derek Braun, Commissioner derek.braun@sfgov.org
Amy Campbell, Commissioner amy.campbell@sfgov.org
Sean McGarry, Commissioner sean.mcgarry@sfgov.org
Gilbert Williams, Commissioner gilbert.a.williams@sfgov.org
Jonas Ionin, Secretary commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

**From:** Tim Colen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 5:02:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tim Colen
timcolen@gmail.com
1501 Greenwich St, Unit 502
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** Liam Hennessy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** RE: OPPOSITION to Proposed Family Zoning Plan (2021-005878 GPA PCA MAP)
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 4:59:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Whom It Concerns

My name is Liam Hennessy and I have lived in North Beach since 1985. I reside in a flat on Pfeiffer and Stockton streets. My neighborhood was not originally included in any upzoning plan until our Supervisor Danny Sauter decided to add it. Why? He has never answered this question or many others that neighbors such as myself have tried to get him to answer.

I am very upset that without so much as a public meeting or notification, North Beach was put into this reckless plan even though the neighborhood is already one of the densest in our beautiful city. The creators and backers of this plan never took into account any of the concerns of the neighborhood's residents! Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter even postponed the voting on North Beach becoming a Historic Neighborhood, in hopes I am sure, that it would not get in the way of his "Family Zoning Plan" proposal being adopted.

There has not been enough collaboration with the people who are going to be most affected by this proposal.This Family Zoning plan was not created to enrich the lives of individuals who want to live in North Beach or for those that already do or for those that will be pushed out because of it. This is not an easy fix to our housing crisis. We need to be more creative with our approach to our housing needs. However, those approaches Should Not Come from the Big Developers trying to get a HUGE WINFALL or POLITICIANS WHO ARE BOUGHT in order to climb the political ladder BUT by the people of North Beach. We have a huge stake in this and this decision will change the neighborhood forever. Once it is done there is no going back. Remember the Redevelopment Era?

The plan to include North Beach into Lurie's Upzoning proposal was a blatant lie to all of the residences and businesses in North Beach by politicians that used their power to hide the fact that their ambition for power/money is more important than the community that elected them.
Making decisions about the fate of a person's neighborhood behind a facade of wanting to create more housing for the working people is disingenuous, especially since it was all hidden from the constituents. High Rise Condominiums all along the Wharf, splattered around North Beach, Telegraph Hill, etc will not be affordable to the individuals that this proposal is trying to house. It will only be affordable to the rich, It will ruin the neighborhood and it will

create another redevelopment nightmare with horrible consequences.

Danny Sauter and his YIMBY lobbyists along with the Planning Department have not involved the neighborhood residents, businesses etc. in the decision to replace our incredible neighborhood, which tourists travel the world to see, with a Miami Beach one instead.
This plan was not done with the constituents' needs in mind, but rather with those of developers and Mr Sauter's donors instead( and in secret ). It is not what is best for North Beach or the City at large.
native, as a retired San Francisco Unified School teacher I plead that you really take a hard look at what is being proposed, how it will impact North Beach and the City at large, maybe even go to St. Peters and Pauls and pray on it… you never know.

Onwards,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer Street
San Francisco Ca 94133Please make significant changes to the UpZoning map because it will destroy North Beach. As a

**From:** Samah Shah
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 4:37:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Samah Shah
samahsemail@gmail.com
1732 Anza St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Molly Ryan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 3:28:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Molly Ryan
mollybierman@gmail.com
2440 Green Street
San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** chrisalism@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Mallia
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 3:26:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): My husband and I bought our beautiful 1911 house in 1989. We love our neighborhood and neighbors in the Outer Sunset. We ask that Mayor Daniel Lurie, the Supervisors and Boards appreciate and protect us from Upzoning and the unwanted and negative changes proposed to our historic neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Christina Mallia
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** allie@thekelsey.org
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 3:10:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Commissioners and Supervisors,

On behalf of The Kelsey, we write in strong support of the Family Zoning Plan. As a San Francisco–based nonprofit co-developing affordable, accessible, and inclusive housing, and advancing policies that make disability-forward housing the norm, we recognize how urgently the city needs bold action to address its housing shortage.

The Family Zoning Plan is critical to advancing inclusive housing, addressing our housing shortage, and undoing exclusionary zoning practices. By allowing more homes to be built in San Francisco's neighborhoods, this plan helps create housing that is:

- More available – Increasing overall housing supply makes it possible for more people, including disabled people, low-income residents, and families of all kinds, to secure a stable home in the city.
- More affordable – Increasing supply helps moderate costs across the housing market. Just as importantly, new development under this plan will deliver more inclusionary affordable units, directly expanding deeply needed affordable housing opportunities.
- More accessible – Newer and larger housing is more likely to meet modern accessibility standards, and can go further by incorporating cross-disability design principles such as those outlined in the Inclusive Design Standards. More new homes mean more homes that work for people with disabilities, older adults, and others with diverse access needs.

This plan is aligned with The Kelsey's vision for disability-forward housing: communities that are affordable across income levels, accessible to people with diverse disabilities, and inclusive of people with and without disabilities living side by side. Expanding supply through thoughtful zoning reform is a critical part of making this vision real in San Francisco.

At the same time, zoning reform alone will not solve the city's housing crisis. We urge the City and County of San Francisco to complement the Family Zoning Plan with increased public investment in affordable housing, including:

- Greater subsidy for affordable housing production and preservation to ensure affordability to people living at extremely low incomes, including San Franciscians who rely on SSI;
- Inclusionary zoning that targets more deeply affordable homes, including percentage adjustments for developers who include units at 15-20% AMI;

- Require or incentivize new developments to go beyond minimum accessibility, ensuring housing works for people with a wide range of disabilities;
- Acquisition and designation of land specifically for affordable housing; and
- Targeted housing supports for the most marginalized communities, including low-income people, people with disabilities, and those who have been displaced.

The Family Zoning Plan is a leap forward for San Francisco housing policy. When paired with stronger investments in affordability, accessibility, and inclusion, it can help ensure our city builds the housing needed so all residents—disabled and non-disabled, across all incomes—can thrive.

Thank you for your leadership and for advancing policies that move us closer to a more equitable and inclusive San Francisco.

allie@thekelsey.org
1 Sansome St
San Francisco, California 94104

**From:** kuongpm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phoebe Kuong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 2:12:39 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Phoebe Kuong
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Ciara Keegan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 2:07:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Ciara
California

**From:** Melissa Petlak
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:51:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Melissa Petlak
melissa.kolod@gmail.com
1863 Filbert St
San Francisco , California 94123

**From:** ariane.electra@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:45:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** geoff.gordon.smith@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:42:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** mghernandez117@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:36:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent and rent controlled tenant, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Melissa

California

**From:** noahsloss@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Noah Sloss
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:11:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

As a rent controlled tenant it's obvious this plan will incentivize the owner of my building and others like it to evict and demolish. I will not forget your actions on this issue.

Sincerely,
Noah Sloss
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** ferrante.lynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Ferrante
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:01:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): also this is just. Too much for the areas around Van Ness Ave where the neighborhood has been subject to extended periods of construction along the Van Ness corridor, whichfor years made it difficult to use local businesses. Construction of high-rise buildings will bring us back into that setting again, which is really unfair to businesses and also unfair to the neighborhood. I am totally against this plan because it enables and encourages extreme high rises which will end up being luxury apartments, and result in little or no low cost housing. The limit in this area should be 6 stories which is reasonable, considering developers, always put things on the roof that make it seem like more seven stories and put high ceiling retail on the first floor to provide better views to the upper floors. I am not against more housing, I am against this plan, which puts the brunt of the development and construction in the Van Ness and surrounding Russian Hill and Polk Gulch areas which are completely different in character . Also lower Van Ness is completely different than upper Van ness and you should take that into consideration in your plan as well . Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** l_bluestone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Louise Bluestone
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 1:00:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Louise Bluestone
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** ycg1226@proton.me
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:39:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** justin.t.dolezal@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:35:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** gmclaughlin415@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:29:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** marlowekarl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marlowe Bjorklund
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:26:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marlowe Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** wongchowfun@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:20:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Let's not turn our beautiful city into Manhattan. Let's make sure we protect our low-rise historic neighborhoods while ensuring affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Sharon Wong
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** denniseblum@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis blum
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 11:48:16 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dennis blum
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** jamesd13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James d Nicholson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 11:24:20 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): this whole situation that you are putting us residents in is completely out of whack. This will destroy the character of the sunset and all of San Francisco. High rises stay downtown residential houses and no more than four units on commercial corridors. Please reconsider this devastating zoning plan. I have children that would love to stay in San Francisco, but all of this housing being built will be market rate. Which is still out of touch for the middle class. From what I see this is all backed by out of the area, billionaires who are looking for long-term speculation opportunities.

Sincerely,
James d Nicholson
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** jvistnes1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Vistnes
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 10:18:46 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

When I spoke to Mayor Lurie at the Union Street Festival when he was campaigning for Mayor, I asked him for his position on the upzoning in the Cow Hollow and Marina neighborhoods. He said that he thought that six stories would be reasonable. Now the heights are eight stories along a large portion of Lombard Street and rise to 14 STORIES on Lombard from Laguna going east towards Van Ness. That's quite a difference, with enormous implications for the iconic views that tourists come to this neighborhood to admire. I urge you to reconsider the extremely tall towers that will block some of the most beautiful public views of the bay and hills for residents as well as tourists walking around and driving those little yellow Go Cars. Please don't put many "Fontana Towers" at the bottom of a hill - blocking the views that make San Francisco the most beautiful city in the country - if not the world.

Sincerely,
Jessica Vistnes
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** zizivaga@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vivian Imperiale
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 9:57:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable

San Francisco should be proud of the several well-thought-out residential parks in our city. I was a happy homeowner in a different neighborhood but when a home in Ingleside Terraces came on the market I made an immediate offer and now have lived here since the Seventies. I used to go by the neighborhood on the bus and admired what I saw. Now it is wonderful to live in an area with front, side, and back gardens. We should cherish special neighborhoods that cannot be replaced. This one is a gift from the developer, Leonard, who went broke because he insisted on using high quality materials such as redwood. In a novel move he built homes around a former historical racetrack. I walk my dog on the central street that follows the racetrack configuration.

Ingleside Terraces architectural and historical place in San Francisco should be honored and left intact.

Sincerely,
Vivian Imperiale
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** klschulkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of karen schulkin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:41:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
The citizens of SF need to be involved in the decision making. This is a most important piece missing here. We know there are ways to intervene with the State and expect you to do so. Thank you.

Sincerely,
karen schulkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** shaylamihalypro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shayla Mihaly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:09:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please do not ruin our beautiful city out of ego and greed. Very few will benefit and many will suffer. SF deserves better than this.

Sincerely,
Shayla Mihaly
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** bspfitch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Fitch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 10:35:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): All the talk about "housing" when there are vacant residential units. The city allows venture capitalists and foreign investors to sit on empty properties. Additionally, there are vacant lots, abandoned retail and other sites that could be developed without destroying existing housing and businesses.

Sincerely,
Robert Fitch
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 10:24:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

**From:** catherinerobyns@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Robyns
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 8:57:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Catherine Robyns
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 8:22:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Tell Lurie and Turncoat Sauter to BACK OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2025 8:18:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Tell Lurie and Turncoat Sauter to BACK OFF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Small Business Forward |
| **To:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary |
| **Subject:** | Letter from Westside & Northern neighborhood business leaders |
| **Date:** | Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:28:55 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Westside & Northern Business Leaders letter-11.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mayor Lurie,

Attached is an open letter from Westside & Northern neighborhood business leaders expressing our opposition to the upzoning plan.

We've posted this letter online and are periodically updating the letter as additional small business leaders sign on.

Sincerely,
Christin Evans

Co-owner, Booksmith & Alembic
Steering Committee Member, Small Business Forward

cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission

smallbusinessforward.org

Dear Mayor Lurie,

As Westside and Northern neighborhood business leaders, we oppose your proposed upzoning plan. Despite being labeled “family zoning,” the plan will not deliver affordable housing for working families or protect small, family-run businesses. Instead, it threatens to displace workers, shutter long-standing neighborhood institutions, and hand over our communities to speculative development.

Already, parcels are being acquired and storefronts left vacant in anticipation of redevelopment. Our neighborhood businesses—still recovering from the pandemic, debt, and rising costs—cannot survive without stronger protections. The proposed upzoning, which allows 6–14+ story projects to replace century-old, three-story buildings, would overwhelm narrow streets, strain emergency services, and force closures of businesses that have served San Francisco for generations.

Currently your proposed upzoning has:

- **No early notification** of housing development projects with current commercial tenants or to neighboring commercial tenants.
- **No displacement assistance** for small businesses displaced by rising rents, non renewal of lease, including no provision for relocation assistance (such as AB2011 style payments determined by length of tenancy.)
- **No construction mitigation or financial consideration for neighboring small businesses** that will see loss of parking and interruption of foot traffic due to lengthy construction projects.
- **No requirement that new construction will be suitable for small businesses** to return to or rent at affordable rates. As we’ve seen with development along Market Street and Ocean Avenue, more than half of new buildings still have vacant storefronts years after completion. Warm shell conditions should be required, including suitable turn key spaces for displaced restaurants.
- **No recognition of the likely displacement of working class jobs** for luxury housing we can’t afford. Small business workers typically make 30-80% of Area Median Income (AMI) – about **$30k - $80k per year.** The housing demographic that your plan targets is only accessible to those making $120k or more per year, with an average rent over $3,000 per month, vastly out of reach for our workers.

Our intact neighborhood commercial corridors are the charming villages that help make San Francisco such a desirable place to live and work. We are tight-knit communities that weathered a global pandemic, but have not benefited from the continued focus on Downtown revitalization. The proposed upzoning would supercharge displacement of beloved “mom & pop” neighborhood businesses due to higher rents and little to no legal protections. It would increase the number of vacancies along our corridors, lead to business disruption and job loss, and bring a number of disruptive construction projects, harming our economic vitality.

Much more needs to be done to mitigate the very real harms that can be anticipated from the blanket upzoning proposed. We urge you to engage with us on adding real and meaningful solutions to mitigate these harms and engage with us around our thoughts on proposed solutions for addressing the affordable housing need:

- **Work with neighborhood groups to identify appropriate sites** for higher-capacity development without destroying existing corridors.
- **Establish real protections** to prevent small business closures and layoffs.
- **Preserve Legacy Businesses and beloved institutions** that provide historic enrichment, cultural pride, and help define their communities for locals and tourists alike.
- **Invest in Small Business Funds.** Invest in small business funds and support, rather than directing all resources downtown.

Sincerely,

Jesse Ahluwalia, The Laundry Corner (Inner Richmond)

Shelby Ash, The Music Store (West Portal)

Richard Azzolino, Sotto Mare Restaurants (North Beach)

Bill Barnickel, President Outer Sunset Merchants Professional Association (Outer Sunset)

Kenzie Benesh, Yo También Cantina (Inner Sunset)

Elias Bikahi, Le Sandwich (North Beach)

Belle Bueti, Body Philosophy Club (Clement)

Anna Bullard, West Portal Bookshop (West Portal)

Liam Caldwell, Armstrong Carpet's (West Portal)

Regan Caponi, O'Reillys Pub (Haight-Ashbury) and Comet Club and President of Union Merchants Association (Union Street)

Janet Clyde, Vesuvio Cafe (North Beach)

Shawn Connolly, SF Skate Club & EduSkate (Western Addition)

Robert Emmons, SF Mercantile (Haight-Ashbury) & Welcome to Castro (Castro) and President of Haight-Ashbury Merchants Association (Haight-Ashbury)

Christin Evans, The Booksmith & The Alembic (Haight-Ashbury)

Jeremy Fish, Fish Tank (North Beach)

Pedro Galletti, Mozzarella di Bufala Restaurant (West Portal)

Nikki Greene and Isabella Hill, Happy House (North Beach)

Thomas Hamilton, Gamescape (Divisadero)

David Heller, Beauty Network and President of Greater Geary Boulevard Merchants (Geary)

Judy Irving, Pelican Media (North Beach)

Tony Kamel, Sunset Shoe Repair (Inner Sunset)

Kamal Kandel, Sewa (Inner Richmond) and Yarsa's Restaurant (North Beach)

Rick Karp and David Karp, Cole Hardware (Cole Valley, North Beach, Russian Hill)

Elaine Katzenberger, City Lights Booksellers & Publishers (North Beach)

Nolan Kellett, Hawaii West (North Beach)

Teague Kernan, Tupelo & Belle Cora  (North Beach)

Sean Kim, Joe's Ice Cream (Central Richmond)

Darren Lacy and Jennifer McMahon, Da Flora Restaurant (North Beach)

Dennis Lin, Burmese Kitchen (Inner Richmond)

Frances Lau, S & S Grocery (North Beach)

Matt Lopez, White Cap (Taravel)

Danny Macchiarini, Macchiarini Creative Design (North Beach)

Lisa Merrall, Fireside Bar (Inner Sunset)

Marcus Moo, Alushe Coffee Bar (Geary)

Lisa Moore, Siren Boutique (West Portal)

Pete Mulvihill & Kevin Ryan, Green Apple Books (Inner Sunset, Clement)

Quentin Navia, Peña Pachamama (North Beach)

Andrew Nelson and Caitlyn Skye Wild, Golden Sardine (North Beach)

Brody Nowak, Rising Star Laundry (Cole Valley)

Annie O'Keeffe, O'Keeffe's Bar (Inner Richmond)

Ida Pantaleo Zoubi, Caffe Trieste (North Beach)

Sunshine Powers, Love on Haight (Haight-Ashbury)

Al Ribaya, Al's Attire (North Beach)

Nicole Schwieterman, Fleetwood SF (Clement)

Mark Sodini, Sodini's Restaurant (North Beach)

Lynnet Spiegel, Jeffrey's Natural Pet Foods (North Beach)

Hanna Suleiman, Cafe Greco (North Beach)

Deidre Von Rock, Von Rock Law and President of West Portal Merchants Association (West Portal)

Richard & Amanda Weld, Tantrum (Clement)

Wendy Williams, Day Moon Bakery (Outer Sunset)

Diana Zogaric, Shaw's Ice Cream (West Portal)

Shadi Zughayar, Coit Liquor and Alimento (North Beach)

Other merchant leaders signing in solidarity with Westside & Northern Neighborhood leaders:

Henry Karnilowicz, President of South of Market Business Association (South of Market)

Cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission

**From:** Gerard Koskovich
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan: Protect Rent-Controlled Housing
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:58:04 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why I join the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods in calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future. As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.

Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing. Likewise reserve large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom—including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.

Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"). Enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Gerard Koskovich

Gerard
California

**From:** Gregory Sykes
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:53:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Gregory
California

**From:** jeanettetraverso@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Traverso
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:50:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My family & I have lived in North Beach for decades. We should convert the existing oversupply of vacant buildings into housing. That way we solve the housing & vacancy problems without destroying the incomparable character of our walkable neighborhoods. My husband I have worked long & hard to create a wonderful life in San Francisco. For all the reasons below, I beg you to reverse course on your upzoning development plans.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Jeanette Traverso
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** SARA MILES
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Amend Lurie's Redevelopment Plan
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:48:41 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

SARA
California

**From:** sarahoreilly3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah O"Reilly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:22:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello All San Francisco Elected Officials,

My name is Sarah O'Reilly and I live at 2034 Leavenworth St. #4 in Russian Hill. My husband was a San Francisco native as was his father, Aunts and Uncles and he loved this city. We believe that we should be offered affordable housing for more people but that we should do it in keeping with our amazing, beautiful city. Please consider a more thought out plan.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I really hope this plan can be reconsidered to preserve and expand responsibly our amazing city.

Sarah O'Reilly

Sincerely,
Sarah O'Reilly
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:53:54 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This action will be the biggest threat in San Francisco history to the majority of San Franciscans who are renters. It will displace renters and increase the homeless population. You have a moral obligation to San Franciscans who you represent to vote against this upzoning plan.

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:44:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:44:00 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jg1964chi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Albertson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2025 9:31:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT Please listen to the citizens of this neighborhood. We have a mixture of apartment buildings, 2 flats. 3 flats and single family homes. We are doing just fine. Have you considered fire danger in high risers. And what about blocking sun light and being able to see the sky. And what will be done about parking. You know we pay for parking that gives us the ability  to park 4 to 6 blocks away from where we live. So wonderful to lug groceries up and down the hills. Thanks for reading my comments.

Sincerely,
Joan Albertson
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | SON-SF SaveOurNeighborhoodsSF |
| **To:** | So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary; Chen, Lisa (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Segal, Ned (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) |
| **Subject:** | Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN - September 11, 2025 Meeting |
| **Date:** | Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:39:53 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 9-11-25 - PLANNING COMMISSION LTR SON-SF .pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

**Attention San Francisco:**

Land Use/Transportation Committee

Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Joel Engardio - District 4

Chief of Housing & Economic Development Ned Segal

Mayor Daniel Lurie

Planning Director Sarah Dennis-Phillips

Please see attached PDF Letter to **Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN** - September 11, 2025 Meeting.

Thank you for your time in considering our concerns.

Regards,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
(Co-founders - SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF)
info@sonsf.org

September 10, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

**SUBJECT: Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN** - September 11, 2025 Meeting - Agenda Items 14a and 14b

Dear Commissioners:

SON-SF (Save Our Neighborhoods SF) represents over 4,000 District 4 and other district residents who advocate for thoughtful and inclusive planning, historic preservation, and thriving local businesses in our neighborhoods. We organized around the threat of putting up 50 stories (lowered to 24 stories – for now) at 2700 Sloat Blvd. The Sloat project is still moving forward. This despite the fact that the neighboring six-year-old Westerly project only approximately one-third of the 56 units have sold; the rest remain empty. The Westerly's ground floor commercial space is vacant, and the site generally looks derelict. This project adds nothing to the neighborhood – is this Mayor Lurie's plan for all of the West Side?

SON-SF agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing; however, Mayor Lurie's plan does little to increase the amount of truly affordable housing. Even worse, the plan will have a negative impact on our communities by increasing density and height limits without addressing critical needs such as needing more green space for new residents, increased congestion without MUNI funding for more transit, lack of equity by not placing low-income families in the new, market-rate buildings, and the big one - *infrastructure*. In the Sunset District the lack of adequate water for firefighting is a major concern. If a disaster should occur, there is currently not enough water to put out a fire. The onshore winds from the ocean will quickly push the flames uphill and over into the rest of San Francisco. More density equals more fuel. This should be a concern for the entire city.

The Planning Department maps change every week. There is a lot of confusion over the Mayor Lurie's proposed map and the further impact that state legislation will have on the final allowed heights. The entire system around this upzoning map is so opaque that some local groups have held Town Halls to try to explain to residents what the City wants to do.

However, our greatest concern is that the focus has been on the City telling us what the City wants to do. There have been no plans to involve the neighborhoods in local-level decision-making about what is going to happen specifically to their neighborhood, to their business district, and even to the lot next door to them.

A city can and should have more than one type of housing. People move to the Sunset and the Parkside from other parts of the city because the families want individual homes and yards for their children to play in. We need a plan that involves the residents, so that we can plan for new affordable housing and increased density in a way that does not destroy the resources that attract people to our neighborhood in the first place.

Sincerely,
Renee Lazear & Shawna McGrew
(Co-Founders - SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF)
info@sonsf.org

Cc:
SF Land Use/Transportation Committee
SF Board of Supervisors
SF Supervisor Joel Engardio - District 4
San Francisco Chief of Housing & Economic Development Ned Segal
San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie
SF Planning Director Sarah Dennis-Phillips

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Paul Wermer |
| **To:** | So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); CPC-Commissions Secretary; Chen, Lisa (CPC) |
| **Cc:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Segal, Ned (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | OPPOSE: 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:22:56 AM |
| **Attachments:** | PHRA Opposition to Family Zoning Plan.pdf |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Our detailed letter of opposition to the "Family Zoning Plan" is in the attached ***PHRA Opposition to Family Zoning Plan.pdf***

Sincerely,

Paul Wermer

--
Paul Wermer
Board President
Pacific Heights Residents Association

*PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION*
2443 FILLMORE STREET, P.O. BOX 178
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115

September 10, 2025

San Francisco Planning Commission (VIA EMAIL)
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Oppose 14a-c, 2021-005878GPA/MAP/PCA, FAMILY ZONING PLAN

Dear Planning Commissioners:

The Pacific Heights Residents Association (PHRA) represents residents and businesses between Bush & Union Streets and Van Ness & Presidio Avenues. Since our founding in 1972, we have been consistent in our advocacy for good planning and historic preservation.

PHRA would welcome the opportunity to work with Planning to develop the fine grained plan to provide the mixed income housing San Francisco so desperately needs. We understand that housing affordability is a critical problem that San Francisco must address. To do so requires careful, thoughtful planning, with increased height and density in appropriate locations, as well as appropriate changes to land use controls. It needs support from thoughtful policies that 1) ensure both long term affordability for the mix of household incomes and 2) provide for the essential city infrastructure needed to support his growth.

Regrettably, the plan and legislation before us now fails to provide that fine grained plan. While the Family Zoning Plan might increase housing for households in the top quintile of income, it unfortunately fails to address the housing needs of more than 70% of San Francisco households. As such it must be rejected.

This legislation fails to address:

1) how it will ensure adequate housing affordability for the range of household incomes in San Francisco. Without a clear path to that goal, lower income workers will be forced out of San Francisco, with a range of negative impacts to stated city objectives such as addressing climate change, reducing traffic congestion, and equity. Regrettably, in spite of the plan's name, there is nothing that ensures that family-friendly housing will be built, except for families with incomes in the top quintile. In particular, the plan and related legislation appears to ignore the induced demand for BMR units created by market rate development, as documented in Planning's Residential Nexus Study.

2) how existing community character – and indeed local communities themselves – will be integrated into planning decisions. This is a significant quality of life issue, with impacts on various vulnerable segments of the population: the local community is essential for health and well-being. The legislation does not address the complex problem of protecting of our marvelous local retailers, who make our NCDs worth visiting.

3) how the city will plan to implement appropriate upgrades to critical infrastructure, since it does not know when or where significantly increased density will appear.

4) how R-4 zoning impacts equity, mental health and well being by reducing Dwelling Unit Exposure with potential impacts on both children and mobility-impaired people. (per green building research)

These issues are expanded on in the attachment; it is of necessity lengthy.

PHRA would like to be able to support a housing plan that targets mixed income development that meets San Francisco's unmet housing needs, developed in better consultation with the various neighborhoods. That is not this plan. To reiterate, PHRA would welcome the chance to engage with Planning to develop a such a plan. We know there are opportunity sites within our boundaries that could support such housing; we know that careful changes to the zoning controls can help new small business develop.

That is not the type of plan that is before you today. PHRA strongly opposes this plan and legislation because it fails to meet San Francisco's real needs.

Sincerely yours,

Paul H Wermer
President, Pacific Heights Residents Association

cc: Land Use and Transportation Committee, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development, San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

PHRA: Attachment to Letter of Opposition

1) It is clear that San Francisco must provide for housing supporting the mix of incomes in San Francisco, and especially those service workers that make life possible. This legislation fails to provide a clear path to housing that supports households with an income less than that of the top quintile.

Permanently upzoning a very large number of properties in the hope that a small percent of those properties will build more housing is not "planning". It is setting up a process whereby somewhere someone will build some structure in which some unknown number of residential units will be provided at some price to someone who can afford that price. Enabling stochastic processes that are not understood is not planning, and does nothing to assure affordability.

2) The legislation ignores the ramifications of building large numbers of market rate projects of 9 units or less. Yet the newly increased base heights encourage such market rate projects. This ignores the Residential Nexus results that market rate units create a demand for at least 30% of BMR units.

Furthermore, the fact that developers of 10 or more residential units can fee out for ~$250/sq ft means that they are paying less than half the price of an on-site inclusionary unit. If this results in a 100% market rate building, we don't offset existing demand at all – for every 10 market rate units, we need to build at least 3 BMR units, not 2, just to meet the total induced demand (but if they are only paying half the cost for the BMR, will even the 20% of the nominal inclusionary housing be built?)

3) This legislation fails to link developments to the necessary infrastructure improvements required to support an increased population. This includes sewer capacity, electrical demand, transit services – all of which currently have significant local constraints, if not system wide constraints. The impact fees do not cover the Cap Ex requirements for the new infrastructure demand.

Worse, by allowing the RTO-C districts to permit full rear yard coverage on the ground floor, we shift from rear yard infiltration of storm water to an additional 30% storm-water flow during rainfall events for lots with ground floor coverage of the rear yard area. This is a serious problem with the increased probability of extreme precipitation events. This rezoning intentionally aggravates the existing sewage system problems, including increased discharges of polluted water to bay and ocean.

4) The proposed RTO-C zoning allows commercial use up to 4,999 sq ft on a lot, removing potential additional residential units in favor of more profitable business uses. While the legislation prohibits the removal of residential units by a project, it does not require additional units to build up to the base height.

Furthermore, the RTO-C permitted uses have not been discussed with the affected neighborhoods, and most community members have no understanding of what the implications are. While there are appropriate uses, encouraging hotels or short stay lodging in previously residential areas encourages the development of short stay units over long term, rent controlled lodging. And yet the proposed RTO-C allows this.

Furthermore, RTO-C fails to allow trade shops, zoning which might encourage craftspeople to live and work at the same address – something that might help create space for interesting small businesses that create attractions for tourists as well as local residents. Historically business owners lived above their shops – and this might be something to encourage in rebuilding attractive, walkable neighborhoods.

Unless and until there has been neighborhood outreach to identify and address legitimate concerns related to unintended consequences of the rezoning to allow specific commercial uses, this legislation should not be approved.

5) The "plan" does not contain credible protections for existing small businesses from the threats imposed by development projects. These small neighborhood businesses – from restaurants to bars to regional products and carefully curated inventories - these distinct neighborhood commercial districts are essential to making San Francisco an attractive place to visit. Yet they face ill-defined threats under this plan. It is not only the displacement of an existing business on the project site. Less obvious, but very damaging, are the noise and obstructed access that deter customers from patronizing neighboring businesses. Promises of trailing legislation are a way to remove pressure on the City to actually do something meaningful.

6) The plans fails to recognize the significance of neighborhood character, and the importance of historic preservation in maintaining the unique neighborhood characteristics. The reason tourists visit San Francisco is not for its warm and sunny Ocean Beach, or because its theater scene rivals London or New York. It is because of its human scale, the distinct neighborhoods with their own cultures. It is the walkability and the views. And this plan does not recognize these as valuable common assets that we all benefit from.

References supporting the argument that this plan will not address the housing affordability problem:

1) The Emperors New Housing (a thorough examination of the housing problem)
2) Incomes Determine Housing Prices (A Federal Reserve Bank blog post)
3) Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities (Federal Reserve Bank Working Paper)
4) New high density rental construction in England actually increased area rents
5) Chicago – Increased density increased housing costs
6) Austin, TX upzoning did not reduce housing costs
7)There are numerous articles on the Minneapolis 2040 Rezoning plan, which upzoned large areas. The 2040 plan appears to have reduced the rate of rent increases, but not improved affordability.
8) An online search on TOD and property values primarily finds articles highlighting increases in property values, but not improved affordability.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 104 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, September 4, 2025 12:36:20 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 104 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 14 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** kh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of kaivan harouni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 9:43:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
kaivan harouni

**From:** lilyffll90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lily Leung
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 11:00:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lily Leung

**From:** mike.gilleran@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of mike gilleran
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 11:57:04 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

My wife and I have lived in Ingleside Terraces for 39 years. We love the neighborhood. We moved to IT in 1986 because of the single-family home character of the neighborhood. The thought that these wonderful homes could be demolished and turned into four story multi-unit dwellings (with the attendant significant infrastructure problems) is frightening. Not to mention six stories for corner lots!

It will take just one neighbor to sell to a developer for the downhill skid to begin, and the character of the neighborhood will change no matter how luxurious the new buildings are (with parking?). I can understand thoughtful upzoning on commercial corridors such as Ocean Avenue, although I worry about the future of small businesses on that corridor as well as on West Portal as I am not aware of any guaranteed protections for our small businesses. But the introduction of multi-unit dwellings with substantial new height and land use allowances (and there is nothing "gentle" about any of that) in any neighborhood is not sound thinking. My wife lived in Manhattan. That is not our vision for this wonderful city.

Again, I can understand thoughtful upzoning on commercial corridors, with protection for small businesses. I cannot understand or support the current upzoning plan as it pertains to all SF neighborhoods. This is a bad idea, and there is no going back once the mistake is made.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
mike gilleran
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** cathi.dennehy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Dennehy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 2:37:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear San Francisco Department of Building and Planning, San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lurie.

I am a mutli-generational San Franciscan with roots in the city that date back to the 1860's. I was disheartened to see the new proposal for upsizing of buildings around the city.

I oppose building heights of 60 feet and above in residential neighborhoods, such a along Chestnut and Lombard streets. High rise structures will permanently change the character of the city landscape. I would like to see the history and beauty of the city maintained. I understand that some expansion for housing is necessary.

High rise structures should be limited to downtown areas like other major cities, where there is also opportunity for repurposing of existing structures (once used as offices, can become housing). Let's repurpose what we can to see what we need, before upsizing everywhere across the city!

This is an extreme proposal that is being considered. When high rise structures are erected in residential areas, it drastically changes city character and NOT FOR the better.

I request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required.

PLEASE, PLEASE Stop and reset your plans so as to not destroy a gorgeous city into one that is overbuilt, unattractive, and lacking any character at all. There is still time to DO what is right for San Franciscans and generations to come.

Sincerely,
Catherine Dennehy
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** tiredepot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jimmy Ng
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:34:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jimmy Ng
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erik Sens
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:51:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** pingli28@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alan Yuan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:52:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alan Yuan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** thomasorgain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Orgain
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:53:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Thomas Orgain
Auburn, CA 95602

**From:** taylorc2525@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Clara Taylor
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 4:36:43 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

***** Please ethically perform your sworn duty for our communities. We are the communities who voted for you. Please please take a moment to consider if this was you and your family your immediate and extended family. How would you feel about having all of your entire community rezoned so that you did not have your community anymore at all ever. Again, I ask you to perform your sworn ethical duty to protect and uplift our communities not demolish our communities. we voted for you, remember that.

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Clara Taylor
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** djamgarov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vladimir Djamgarov
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 5:11:39 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Vladimir Djamgarov
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** tofufight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip von Furstenberg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 5:14:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The home I live in was bought by my father, who handed the house down to me. He worked extremely hard his entire life to take care of his family. It is a tremendous honor to take care of the home he worked so hard for. The neighborhood is an amazing place to live and call home. Tearing up this neighborhood will make a few people rich, but the majority of people even worse off. A handful of people will buy a big condo and never set foot it in it. Prices will skyrocket and less people like teachers and county workers will be able to afford to live in the community they work in.

Sincerely,
Philip von Furstenberg
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** milomatthews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Milo Matthews
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 5:58:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Milo Matthews
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** planetpotts@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Potts
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 6:33:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A life long resident of the Sunset district I strongly oppose the upzoning proposed which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Strive to represent your constituents and not developers and lobbyists

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps

- Request an extension of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline so that communities you serve have a voice

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement pure and simple. Stop the madness

Sincerely,
Janet Potts
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** molinelli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Molinelli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 7:43:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Please look at the vacant housing in this city and the amount of luxury housing that is VACANT! Stop attacking middle class residents and small business owners like myself and my husband a teacher, when we can barely afford the city and are being attacked. There is so much housing being built for luxury and it's not sustainable. so much of our real estate sits empty - go after foreign owned shell apartments first! Then let's talk up zoning!

Sincerely,
Amy Molinelli
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** jeaninejue.mm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanine Jue
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 9:47:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Sincerely,
Jeanine Jue
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** michaeljbrant@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Brant
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 10:16:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The upzoning proposals are excessive and destructive. Buildings of 8 or 12 or 22 stories are totally out of keeping with the character of the Sunset neighborhood, even along transit corridors. More reasonable heights could fit the neighborhood, while still providing new housing, but not massive apartment blocks. And apparently ANY street could now have developments of four stories? This is unreasonable and destructive and is opposed by all residents of the affected neighborhoods. NO to reckless construction, YES to planning consideration for established neighborhoods. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Michael Brant
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** sebraleaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of sebra leaves
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:00:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
sebra leaves
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** chavja@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andres Chavez
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 9:17:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andres Chavez
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Madeline Campbell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:24:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors and Commissioners,

I am a resident of District 2, right on the border of District 1 and the Richmond District, and I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. My partner and I are young professionals who want to put down roots in San Francisco, but we've realized that even with above-average incomes, homeownership here is far out of reach. That's disheartening for people like us who are committed to this city and want to stay.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes, and the Family Zoning Plan is a thoughtful step forward. It expands housing choices across the city—particularly in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It creates flexibility for families to add backyard units, in-law apartments, and small-scale buildings that allow loved ones to stay close. This plan will help make housing more affordable and accessible for a broader range of San Franciscans.

While there has been some pushback on the west side, as a Richmond resident, I strongly support this plan. Our commercial corridors are ideal for additional housing, and we must do our part to meet the city's housing needs.

This proposal is community-informed, consistent with the Housing Element, and grounded in the real needs of residents. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and sustainable for San Francisco's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone has a place to belong. Thank you for your leadership and collaboration.

Sincerely,
Madeline Campbell

Madeline Campbell
maddiedove8@gmail.com
340 Arguello Blvd Apt. 305
San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** Anna McMurray
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:29:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anna McMurray
annamcm4@gmail.com
1428 Funston Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Charley Goss
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:31:54 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Charley Goss

Charley Goss
charley@sfaa.org
1238 Sutter Street
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** David Harrison
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:47:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

My wife and I are proud San Franciscans and are committed to the prospect of starting and raising our family in San Francisco. Housing costs presents a huge challenge to this dream. San Francisco urgently needs more homes and this proposal presents the measured way to achieve this.

I urge you to please take a stand and support this proposal that is the right thing for San Franciscans and young families. The future of our city depends on it.
Sincerely,
David H.
District 7

David Harrison
deharriso202@gmail.com
200 Irving Street, Apt 7
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** mlrinsfo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martha Rudd
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:40:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Martha Rudd
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of susan mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:18:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This rash upzoning plan comes at a time when residents and employers are not swarming into, but rapidly exiting San Francisco. It comes at a time when our federal government seems intent on telling its citizens how to live -and now the state is telling tax paying, home owning citizens of SF how our neighborhoods should look. Finally, keep in mind that SF is not a city of industry (except, perhaps, for AI). We don't have a business base that is intent on building community as in NYC. We rely on tourism for our revenue -and tourists love the character and welcoming streets of our neighborhoods.

Please put a stop to this gift to developers. It will have long term, harmful impacts that will hurt all of us.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
susan mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:43:52 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Do not destroy the beauty of our city.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** BigWayne19@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wayne Phillips
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:54:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Wayne Phillips
Orinda, CA 94563

**From:** Philip Lumsden
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:57:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Philip
California

**From:** timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:11:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:27:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle

**From:** denolacarole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole De Nola
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:35:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carole De Nola
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Carolyn Miller
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:39:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

To Danny Sauter:

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Miller

Carolyn
California

**From:** FredPenczakMD@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fred Penczak
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:41:14 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The laws which govern development in our communities have been carefully thought out over decades, and millions of Californians have built their lives around them. This assault from Sacramento on all of our communities does not serve us (the constituents), rather the development industry and those who profit from it. In its wake of profiting, our communities, families, and lives are destroyed. You and all our elected representatives should oppose this. Please do your job and protect your community. Thank you, Fred

Sincerely,
Fred Penczak
San Rafael, CA 94903

**From:** magyorke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michelle GT
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:05:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan in District 1, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michelle GT
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** janiceruthwood46@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:12:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** minicazim@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Zimmerman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:37:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):why would you want to change our beautiful and diverse city into manhattan? That's not why we live here!!!
The neighborhoods will change dramatically if you jam more high rises and more people into already full neighborhoods. This would be a huge mistake which will never be able to be changed! Big mistake!

Sincerely,
Monica Zimmerman
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** David Brian Harrington
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:48:13 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

[Arbitrary rezoning lacks the proper focus to solve our city's affordability crisis! Note all the constituencies that have been overlooked!

David Brian Harrington
San Francisco]

David Brian
California

**From:** sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 12:25:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Save our neighborhoods from becoming Manhattens.  Families need space for themselves and their fellow residents.

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** mark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Schlesinger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 12:35:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We are long-time residents of Cow Hollow, and fear what this initiative will do to our neighborhood and others.

Sincerely,
Mark Schlesinger
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Doane
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 2:27:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** lunbeck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Lunbeck
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 4:59:56 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a longtime resident of Lakeside, I urge you to amend this flawed upzoning proposal. Even a single new large apartment building or condo that replaces current Lakeside housing will irretrievably damage the entire neighborhood. This proposal will make nearly every upzoned single-family house a TEARDOWN, as its highest use will be sale for demolition and new multi-family construction. Because of this, upzoning is a strong disincentive to needed maintenance in this historically single-family neighborhood, leading to neighborhood deterioration over time.

I would be happy to discuss further.

Sincerely,
Robert Lunbeck
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 5:22:43 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** beverly.yang@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beverly Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 6:05:17 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I live in Forest Hill, half a block from the Forest Hill Station. The planned rezoning will directly impact my family and my neighbors, disrupting the current quiet and safe family-centered neighborhood culture, impact our property value, introduce unwanted traffic at an already congested intersection, and make the neighborhood less safe for our children. Please allow our community to at least have a voice in these plans that will greatly impact our everyday lives.

Sincerely,
Beverly Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** ron86wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ronald Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:00:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I was born and raised in San Francisco, and I have always loved this city for its neighborhoods that feel like home—places where children can play safely, where neighbors know each other, and where families like mine can grow together. Now, as I raise my own family here, I fear that rezoning our residential areas for commercial buildings will erode that sense of community. What looks like progress on paper will bring traffic, noise, and disruption, and once the heart of a neighborhood is lost, it can never truly be restored.

Sincerely,
Ronald Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** alyssa.jy.wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alyssa Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:12:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 13 year old resident of Forest Hill living on Magellan Street, and I am writing this to tell you that I am strongly in opposition to this building project. I only recently turned 13, and I got the news that my beautiful neighborhood was huddled under the looming threat of 85 foot buildings defacing our streets as a birthday present. I might not be old or powerful enough to understand the turning of the world or the movements of the moon, but I know this much: I will not stand to see my home surrounded by foreign giants of buildings. However, my parents taught me to always see things two ways, so I understand that more housing will allow more people to live in this city. Now please open your eyes to our point of view. We are people who value the simplicity and peacefulness of our lives, and this construction will devastate our home, and, also as my parents taught me, home is where the heart is. And the heart is how we live. This project will affect not just my life, but the lives of my whole family and the rest of my neighbors. The construction extends not only to my home, but also to my school, my friends' houses, and the quiet and festive spots that I cherish most. Imagine if you were a newly turned 13 year old girl celebrating finally being a teenager, when suddenly: BOOM. Tall buildings rise up sinisterly against the skyline of your beloved neighborhood. You rush off to school, away from the nightmare that now surrounds your home, but once you get there, BOOM. More giants cast their shadow over your small school. You run as fast as you can to your favorite comfort shop, but, you guessed it, BOOM. More buildings right on the spot. You realize that basically your whole life is now covered in these giants, and down the street, all your neighbors come to similar conclusion. Surely you, for the good of all these people in the city you have devoted yourself to, can understand our perspective and make a change. Thank you for your time in reading this.

Sincerely,
Alyssa Wong

**From:** vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:55:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
L. Diaz

**From:** Emma Dunbar
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 6:36:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely, a 25 year resident and parent of three children who are North Beach natives and wife of a North Beach small business owner.

Emma Dunbar

Emma
California

**From:** ntlarsen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Niels Larsen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 7:01:22 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Niels Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Lori Brooke
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 7:46:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lori
California

**From:** shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 12:13:40 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear [elected official],

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos San Francisco, CA 94114
Start Over

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** erinkcronjn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Cronin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 12:45:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erin Cronin
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** lisa_youngworth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Youngworth
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 1:57:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lisa Youngworth

**From:** catvse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Torr Tietz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 31, 2025 5:05:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Torr Tietz
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** Ann Robinson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, September 1, 2025 11:22:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Ann
California

**From:** Julie Herrod-Lumsden
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Monday, September 1, 2025 3:20:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis—it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods—a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates—is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent—and a 44-year resident of San Francisco including 35 years in North Beach (long before Lurie and Sauter arrived to destroy them, respectively)—I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement:
Use creative financing and local jobs to construct ALREADY-APPROVED projects while protecting existing communities.

Landbank public sites:
Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

GUARANTEE ACTUAL affordability:
Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom—including releasing VOTER-MANDATED FUNDS for affordable housing.

Protect families:
REQUIRE minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and REMOVE permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and RENT-CONTROLLED housing:
Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect REAL costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, COMMUNITY-DRIVEN planning—not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I IMPLORE you to work with us to make this a REAL community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

In other words, please work with us to develop a community plan that delivers ACTUAL

AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR CITIZENS—not just more power and money for greedy, selfish “politicians” and developers.

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
35-Year North Beach Resident
Retired Coit Tower Employee

Julie
California

**From:** johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John J. Garrity
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 7:30:20 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John J. Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Patricia Callahan
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 8:39:47 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Patricia
California

**From:** calbearsph@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Hechinger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 8:51:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patricia Hechinger
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** rwaller@sbcglobal.net
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, August 28, 2025 5:04:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** Teagan Thompson
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, August 28, 2025 5:26:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Teagan
California

**From:** Jean Oppermann
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, August 28, 2025 6:12:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Jean Oppermann
I worked for and voted for preserving neighborhoods, protecting and encouraging small business, and helping to make San Francisco affordable for normal people. I can't tell you how disappointed I am with this short sighted plan. I've lived here over 50 years. When a neighborhood is gentrified to blandness San Francisco loses everything that makes it unique and a destination for tourists. I voted for the era of Willie Brown's love affair with big developers to be over.

Jean

California

**From:** Susan Spencer
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Does Not Pencil Out - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, August 28, 2025 7:01:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal looks good at first glance, but it will not mitigate San Francisco's affordability crisis. Upzoning will make the situation worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development. In San Francisco, we already have so much luxury housing sitting unoccupied (and unsold) that it should be clear we don't need more of the same old same old.

The Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – has a better plan for San Francisco's future. I urge you to support it.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Susan
California

**From:** bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, August 28, 2025 8:36:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** Tes Welborn
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Is Not Real Affordability!
**Date:** Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:03:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Instead of a give away to developers and some big property owners, protect San Francisco neighborhoods, business districts, and actively build affordable housing, 30-80% AMI.
Don't have the funds now? Get options on key sites, and tell Newsom to cough up the money!
The mandate to rezone is an unfunded mandate.

A long time resident, I know how important our neighborhoods, their shopping districts, an small business in general are to our city. And to that important commodity: tourism. Small businesses create more jobs than all the big businesses.

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Tes
California

**From:** Jean Balibrera
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 8:37:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Jean
California

**From:** phil.lumsden999@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 8:54:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Paul Conroy |
| **To:** | MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS); CPC-Commissions Secretary; "ITHA Board" |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 29, 2025 11:43:32 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Ingleside Terraces, a century-old neighborhood of 738 homes, is a vibrant, diverse community of homeowners, renters, families and seniors. With twice the city's average number of children, our neighborhood offers family-sized housing within walking distance of small businesses on Ocean Avenue and West Portal. We strongly oppose the so-called "Family Zoning Plan" as it will dismantle this community through speculative development and demolition.

**This proposal isn't a family housing plan - it's a demolition plan.** Density decontrol, as proposed, eliminates unit limits on single-family parcels. It incentivizes demolition of some of San Francisco's most affordable family housing stock to make way for high-rent, small-unit developments unsuitable for families. This plan encourages speculative redevelopment that will drive up land values, displace families, and erode thriving communities.

**This proposal will destroy thriving communities.** The proposed unconstrained upzoning and density decontrol will destabilize neighborhoods, drive tenant and small business evictions, and hollow out small, local business districts like Ocean Avenue, West Portal Avenue and Lakeside Village. Density decontrol risks paving over vital green spaces. We welcome thoughtful planning and for over 100 years, our neighborhood has supported development along Ocean Avenue. But this proposal is rezoning without a plan.

**The state's 82,000-unit housing mandate ignores economic realities.** The mandate overrides San Francisco's rights, as a Home Rule Charter City, to regulate its own housing development as a municipal function.  San Francisco should instead challenge the state's unrealistic population projections, since it is already the densest city in California and the second densest city in the United States, second only to New York City. The high cost of housing in New York City proves that densification does not produce lower housing costs.

**The City does not face a housing supply shortage.** In fact, the Planning Department's Q2 2025 data shows a pipeline of 71,183 new units, including over 10,000 units near Ingleside Terraces at Balboa Reservoir, Stonestown, and Parkmerced. Meanwhile, the city's population has declined by 31,938 since 2020, with an estimated 36,000 vacant units. The proposal's emphasis on increasing the supply of housing units is misguided because the San Francisco housing market doesn't follow the laws of textbook supply and demand. Over the past 30 years, housing stock grew 27% while population increased only 11%, yet rent and housing prices still soared. The development encouraged by this proposal will be market-rate and aimed towards higher income individuals, further exacerbating affordability problems.

We propose the following recommendations to align any zoning plan with community and citywide goals:

1. **Remove Density Decontrol and maintain setbacks, height transitions, and massing rules. -** Existing approved projects in the pipeline and capacity can accommodate more than the 82,000 state mandated new housing units without demolishing thriving neighborhoods. The current planning code prevents outsized structures from overwhelming existing blocks. Existing codes maintain green space - crucial for environmental sustainability, providing carbon sequestration, improved air and water quality, and enhanced biodiversity.

2. **Remove provisions that allow 65' heights on interior residential street corner lots and 8,000 square foot lots.** This provision will result in taller, randomly-placed towers among otherwise consistent 1-4 story residential blocks — with no relationship to neighborhood form or any broader planning vision. Proposed lot mergers will invade vital greenbelts, backyards, and trees that provide vital open space in an otherwise dense urban environment.

3. **Provide for a forty-foot height limit** on residential and commercial corridors in and immediately surrounding Ingleside Terraces, including Ocean Avenue, which is terraced 25 to 35 feet higher than adjacent single family homes.

4. **Protect historic resources and prohibit demolition of existing housing stock:** Require alternatives to demolition of eligible historic resources (Category A). Apply Preservation Design Standards to new projects in Category A neighborhoods.

5. **Provide housing choices scaled for families with children** and increase the

required family housing units consistent with the City's family-friendly policies. Preserve the small business villages adjacent to neighborhoods.

6. **Ensure adequate infrastructure** - particularly water, fire suppression, sewer, transportation, public safety, and schools. Increased zoning density should not be approved until infrastructure studies have been conducted and capital projects are approved and funded to support the proposed new development.

7. **Incentivize building the existing pipeline**: Encourage developers to build approved units or, if they do not, revoke entitlements.

8. **Repurpose under-utilized buildings**: Offer greater incentives to convert under-utilized downtown structures into housing as has been successfully done in Washington DC, New York and Los Angeles.

**In conclusion**, the "Family Zoning Plan" as proposed encourages the demolition of sound housing that has existed for generations, invites speculation, drives up costs, destroys architecturally historic structures, paves over green space and diminishes community.

We ask that you adopt the recommendations made above, rejecting density decontrol and formulating a sensible plan that preserves our neighborhoods, prioritizes affordability, and includes community input. We strongly support the building of new housing, but any new housing plan needs to be sensible and include the input and collaboration of those who will be most affected. As of now, we have not been included.

San Francisco's families deserve a housing strategy that builds on our strengths, not one that tears them down.

Very truly yours,

Paul Conroy, President
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association
www.ithasf.org

Cc (via email): Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Planning Commission
Ingleside Terraces Homes Association (ITHA) Board of Directors
All Ingleside Terraces residents via Email and ITHA Newsletter
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Neighborhoods United SF

**From:** johnavalos11@gmail.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 12:44:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** shirley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Chow
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 2:42:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Shirley Chow

**From:** Helene Perini
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 3:59:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Helene
California

**From:** Catherine Roads-Redhouse
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 4:05:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a law school student working full time and already my landlord has raised my rent this year. Even though I thought I was protected because of the age of the building I live in, because it is a condo the laws don't apply. I'm worried my landlord will raise it again. The cost of living in the city is so high and I don't see a raise from my job happening in the immediate future while I am still in school.

I love this city and can't imagine living anywhere else. Please don't let this next tech boom force educators and artists out.

Please make amendments to this rezoning that protects renters!

and also.....

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that

repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Catherine

Catherine
California

**From:** Linda Galliher
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 4:43:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Linda Galliher, J.D.

Linda
California

**From:** leebloch@yahoo.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 5:01:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** Chelsea Corbett
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** What are ya'll doing? Why is Sauter turning his back on his neighborhood?
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 5:47:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Personal note: I'm deeply unsettled by Sauter's proposal regarding his, and our, North Beach neighborhood. This is fully against what he campaigned for, and as a young professional in the area that supports development, I'm disturbed by his lack of honesty. We did not vote for that level of hypocrisy. -Chelsea

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Let's be good to one another,
Chelsea

Chelsea
California

**From:** Lori Milburn
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 6:00:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Lori
California

**From:** Blandina Farley
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 6:34:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Personal Letter from Blandina

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to you not just as a long-time resident of North Beach, but as someone who has spent most of my life right here in its heart and whose livelihood is deeply rooted in the soulful backstories, beauty, history & colorful characters of San Francisco. For decades, I've lived above a restaurant on Columbus Avenue, right in the heart of this vibrant, unique neighborhood. I've seen this city grow, shift, and struggle — and I've stood by it through it all, because I love it.

I work as a tour guide, so I talk to people — locals and tourists — every single day. I can tell you without hesitation: they do not come here for high-rises and generic development. They come for the soul of San Francisco. They come for the eccentricity, the color, the music, the art, the activism, and the history. They come for the Beats, the Bohemians, the thinkers, the risk-takers, the ones who dared to live and create freely.

I talk about those people on my "Cirque in the City" tours, and I live among them too. I've worked with North Beach Citizens since Francis Ford Coppola originated the org after recognizing the need while writing the script for the Godfather at Caffe Trieste, have been associated with North Beach Neighbors where I believe Danny started his political journey , and the Telegraph Hill Dwellers. I serve on the board of the North Beach Business Association, and I also work with Music City SF and Dear San Francisco. I've witnessed — and been a part of — communities from the Mission to the Haight to Chinatown rallying around one another, artists supporting small businesses, entertainers and craftspeople keeping culture alive against rising tides of displacement.

Rent control is not just a policy — it's a lifeline. Without it, I simply couldn't afford to live in the city I love, the city I fight for, and the city I represent every day to people from around the world. If it's taken away, people like me — those who are the heartbeat of San Francisco — will be forced out. And what kind of city will we be then?

San Francisco has always been a beacon of compassion, intelligence, and creative thinking. We are known across the globe as a city of freedom, of invention, of care for the marginalized, of spirit that cannot be replicated or replaced. Even when people criticize the United States, they often say, "But I love San Francisco." Let's not betray that legacy.

Please don't stand with those who want to homogenize this city into something unrecognizable — something safe for investors but hostile to the people who give it its soul. Stand with those of us who live here, love it fiercely, and are willing to fight for its future. Protect rent control. Protect our neighborhoods. Protect the people who are San Francisco.

With hope and heart,
Blandina Farley
North Beach Resident & Tour Guide
Board Member, North Beach Business Association
Guide, Cirque in the City Tours / Music City SF / Dear San Francisco

Blandina
California

**From:** s@ssteuer.com
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 9:30:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

California

**From:** Carol Verburg
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 9:52:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, DEFINE AFFORDABILITY LITERALLY INSTEAD OF IN A WAY THAT SHUTS OUT MOST RESIDENTS WHO MOST NEED HOUSING, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Carol
California

**From:** Jean Balibrera
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 10:15:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Jean
California

**From:** Eve Tarquino
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 10:17:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Eve Tarquino

Eve

**From:** Ann Rubin
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Friday, August 29, 2025 10:45:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Ann
California

**From:** diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Giampaoli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:22:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Mayor Lurie. There are plenty of empty buildings in SF where we can give affordable housing without looking like NY. Stop the tall monsters and stop making your buddies rich. If you need to build....build nothing over 4 stories. Please take this into consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Cynthia Servetnick
**To:** BOS-Supervisors
**Subject:** Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:25:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.
Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.
Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.
Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.
Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,

Cynthia
California

**From:** teotose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Levitsn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:27:13 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Beth Levitsn
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** Suzanne Schutte
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:00:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

I am a retired high school teacher and a parent of 2 young adults and a son with ALS. My children grew up in San Fancisco as did I and my parents and grandparents. Two of my children have left San Francisco to find affordable housing elsewhere and I have worked tirelessly to find an apartment for my handicapped son and his caregivers. This once was a vibrant city where teachers and young families could live, raise their families and add their support to public schools and the community. We need more housing to make that possible

This plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Please support this bill!

Suzanne Schutte
suzannecschutte@gmail.com
2445 Pacific Ave
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

**From:** Anton Odqvist
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:01:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Anton Odqvist
anton.odqvist@gmail.com
1428 Funston Ave
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

**From:** Abby Farrell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:08:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Abby Farrell
farrellabby3@gmail.com
1695 Beach St
San Francisco , California 94123

**From:** mlrinsfo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margo Rudd
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:38:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margo Rudd
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:39:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please do not destroy our neighborhoods and make San Francisco just another cookie cutter city without vibrance and personality. Do not take away the what makes each neighborhood unique and ruin it with high rises that make no sense and do not solve issues of affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** WMAECK@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Maeck
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:39:14 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hey Lurie,

You are an SF native. What are you thinking?
Is Sacramento telling you what to do?

It's insane.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
William Maeck
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Weissman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:51:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Beth Weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** bill52kennedy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Kennedy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 12:56:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am not totally opposed to upzoning in SF. Having said that I believe the current proposal goes too far by allowing add-on heights that result in buildings out of scale with many neighborhoods. It seems to me that a more thoughtful approach that targets less developed areas around the Southeast waterfront would not only improve the desirability of these areas but also provide many new housing options. We do not have to destroy the human scale of existing San Francisco neighborhoods in order to get more affordable housing. We just need to develop wastelands like Candlestick point, more of the Hunter's point shipyard and the decaying portions of the South-Eastern Waterfront.

Sincerely,
William Kennedy
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** sfmeancat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Renee Curran
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:04:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Upzoning without any protections or guarantees of actual lived-in housing is simply a demolition plan designed to displace regular working people like me. It's unsustainable and cruel. It's time SF invested in its residents instead of providing more investment opportunities for billionaires.

Sincerely,
Renee Curran
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** dcohen27@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Cohen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:14:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a resident of the Outer Richmond, I'm concerned about the drastically increased height limits in our oceanside neighborhoods, including the Richmond and the Sunset. These new buildings will be too far out of scale with the existing neighborhoods. I'd like to see us be more creative and think about how we can build additional housing near our downtown core, which has denser transit networks, access to BART, etc. and can better handle these taller buildings.

Sincerely,
David Cohen
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** witkasf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SUSAN WITKA
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 1:27:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
SUSAN WITKA
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** mmmail2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 2:26:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Upzoning is not about affordability; the lack of affordable housing, health care, education, and necessities is a product of our unfair economic system. We cannot build our way out of problems caused by wealth disparity.

For example, say a house on a lot is listed at $1m. The developer/investors know that a home will sell for $1m. Upzoning allows a developer/investor to build ten housing units on that one piece of land, so the house has no value, but the land is worth $10m. Now all the neighborhood lots are worth $10m. Each unit doesn't sell for $100,000 $10 m ÷ 10 units), but each unit is listed at $1.5m and may sell for more, depending on who is buying it. By adding more units, that same lot is now worth $15m.

Another example, Vancouver, B.C. has tripled the number of housing units in the last 25 years. The population has not tripled, yet the average home price has gone from CA$400,000 to CA$1,700,000, a four-fold increase. The same is true in San Francisco, CA, where home prices rose 413% between 2000-2020 although the population rose by 12%. It is worth noting that the population rise in both cities was due to an influx of highly paid tech and finance workers, mostly white males, people mostly already in the top 10%.

Upzoning is just selling the city for profit. It is a giveaway to billionaire developers. You should be ashamed to support it.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** elainebregman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elaine Bregman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 2:29:40 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elaine Bregman
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** jscmamacita@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jocelyn Carter
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 3:13:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jocelyn Carter
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 3:48:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** jacksonwongesq@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jackson Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 4:35:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Re-zone the subject property along Laguna Honda Blvd out of the Forest Hill neighborhood that is governed by an HOA.

Sincerely,
Jackson Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** bettymillermd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Betty miller Kolotkin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 5:06:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Building high rise structures would destroy the village shopping and family ambiance of our historic designated  neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Betty miller Kolotkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** Ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 8:48:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** judgold22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Goldstein
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 9:25:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I have lived in the Sunset most of my life and it has already gotten very congested. I live near Irving; there is terrible traffic and NO parking; I drive around for 20 minutes looking for parking. It is insane to build buildings with no parking. The sunset has always had a lower density and profile than other neighborhoods. Please don't ruin it. Please fill vacancies before building more and more ugly buildings that ruin the character of the neighborhood, don't provide parking, and increase traffic and pollution.

Sincerely,
Judith Goldstein
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** l_provenzale@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Provenzale
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, September 3, 2025 10:08:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This will DESTROY what has made San Francisco such a unique and special place to live. You must Preserve historic and unique neighborhoods such as St Francis Wood and others or this city will be transformed negatively and permanently. Please, please, please stop this.

Sincerely,
Laura Provenzale
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** amangan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Aileen Mangan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 9:46:26 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

As a resident of San Francisco for over a decade, I've seen the negative impact of expensive new build apartment buildings in the city. Neighborhoods like Mission Bay are sterile, characterless, and extremely expensive. It is not a walkable neighborhood, public transit is very limited, and there are very few small businesses there, mostly chains. Please do not turn the rest of the city into that. Building housing can be done right and is needed, but this upzoning plan will just lead to even more expensive housing, driving out middle, working, and lower class citizens. I have zero confidence in the Mayor and his new agendas that will only benefit the wealthy. San Francisco is NOT a city for the wealthy. It has a rich history that would negatively impacted by this violent upzoning. THE PEOPLE DO NOT WANT THIS. LISTEN TO YOUR CITIZENS.

Sincerely,
Aileen Mangan
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Family Zoning Plan File Nos. 250700 and 250701 - 252 Letters |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:09:28 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 252 letters.pdf |

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 252 letters from members of the public regarding:

**File No. 250700** - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by: amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

**File No. 250701** - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this Ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Khalil Weldon Hoque |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 28, 2025 1:27:57 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Prodan Statev |
| **To:** | Fielder, Jackie (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | FielderStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 28, 2025 1:55:16 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

I'm a resident of District 9 (16th and South Van Ness). I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:
- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Prodan
487 S Van Ness Ave

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Michael Ducker |
| **To:** | Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | SherrillStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 28, 2025 3:15:41 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPhone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carrie Barnes |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 2, 2025 11:28:03 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Carrie Barnes (thank you again!)

Sent from my iPhone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Pauline Lambert |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:10:38 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Andrew Lee |
| **To:** | Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | MahmoodStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:45:31 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building  more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Referencing the article for easy access - https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-28-how-popular-is-housing/

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue!

Best,
Andrew

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Thom Vavrina-Flores |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:54:33 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors, I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan. As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Thom Vavrina-Flores
631 Ofarrell St

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Angelica Michela |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:26:10 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Angelica Michela
District 7

Sent from my iPhone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Annette Billingsley |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 3, 2025 7:25:39 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPad

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Emily McDonnell |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Monday, August 4, 2025 2:35:01 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building  more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Emily McDonnell
94110

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Tracy Tran |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Monday, August 4, 2025 4:18:57 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building  more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Santosh Jayaram |
| **To:** | Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | MandelmanStaff (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | Please act on SF housing needs.. |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:13:16 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Rafa:

I am writing to urge you to prioritize more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

Too many families are being priced out, and our city is falling dangerously behind on its state housing targets—by about 90%. If we fail to act, we risk losing local control over zoning altogether. Building more homes isn't just about meeting quotas; it's about ensuring San Francisco remains a place where people from all walks of life can live, work, and raise families.

I appreciate your attention to this issue and your efforts to help make San Francisco a city that is affordable and welcoming for everyone.

Sincerely,

Santosh Jayaram

PS: I am a supporter of yours and appreciate what you do on the board. Thank you.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stephen Voris |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 4:55:21 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPhone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Paul |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | Yes! I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:16:29 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,
I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan. As someone who rented in the sunset for 8 plus years and recently switched to owning a home, yes, you betcha, pretty please, let's build more for all types and income levels and family sizes.

This seems to be in line with the polling. Polling consistently shows that the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is way, way, way behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.
Paul Foppe
2301 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:57:22 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):i moved to San Francisco 50 years ago for its character and UNESCO world site beauty. Treating this beautiful, unique city like an unremarkable piece of developable land is a crime against beauty and reason. STOP IT!
Also, the city has lost by emigration since Covid enough population to render unnecessary the building of the mandated 80,000 units. Why this urge to destroy neighborhoods for the sake of increasing density that residents don’t want or need?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:05:32 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** 4lisavukovic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Vukovic
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:25:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Nothing about the plan tackles affordable housing. We have tons of empty warehouses in the Dogpatch and other neighborhoods that could be expanded. We shouldn't ruin well established, expensive neighborhoods with putting in new developments that ARE NOT affordable.

Sincerely,
Lisa Vukovic
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** erikashe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Shershun
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:26:33 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erika Shershun
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:29:40 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long time San Franciscan, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. While I understand the need to addres housing, this approach would encourage wide spread demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. High-rises are out of character with our neighborhoods and unafordabl for most San Franciscans.

We call on you to:

- Significantly reduce and scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Delay the January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow meaningful public input.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

The upzoning may serve powerful developers, but it does not serve the people of this city. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** mcheylin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Heylin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:05:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary Heylin
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:19:13 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear elected officials,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of K. Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:31:33 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SAVE OUR CITY!  We have 70K (?) new units already approved, let’s add 15K more and STOP and see how the infrastructure holds up… build on the outskirts of town, like HISTORIC cities all over the world have done to expand. The Bayview is available, with a transit line there, don’t destroy our Victorian neighborhoods!!  In my neighborhood, Duboce Park is turning 125 years old soon, we love our quality of life with no density increases.

Sincerely,
K. Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | njzajac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Zajac |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:31:57 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nancy Zajac
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:17:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** pete@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Solvik
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:19:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco voting and tax paying resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Peter Solvik
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** patricia_sur@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Sur
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:31:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.  I do support taller buildings in already-commercialized corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patricia Sur
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANITA DEMAS
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:41:43 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am disgusted and disappointed in this zoning non-solution. It will be disastrous to the look, feel and fabric of our city. The fact that affordability is not the main goal and that all the up-zoning is occurring along high rent corridors is proof that this is not to solve the housing crisis but to enrich developers and those with a financial stake in the plan. Shame on you all for entertaining this.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
ANITA DEMAS
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:52:43 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 4:27:56 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

North Beach is a historical district and needs to remain so - no up zoning in the most dense neighborhood in San Francisco

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mary.hall.benjamin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Benjamin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 5:31:14 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: the Marina District is a charming “village” that retains the original buildings and atmosphere from its concept. The new ordinance to allow tall buildings will ruin this.

Sincerely,
Mary Benjamin
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** monicareina@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Reina Kadner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:38:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am not against creating real affordable housing for everyone but it should not be at the risk of destroying the soul of our dear city. High rises are not a good idea in a seismic area. We should build beautiful homes no taller than 4-6 stories and repurpose all those taller empty building that are already part of the looks in downtown San Francisco where a lot of people can also live and there is enough public transportation.

Sincerely,
Monica Reina Kadner
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** markphil711@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Philpott
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:15:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Greetings All,

I've lived in San Francisco since my mid-twenties, and have a five year Bachelor of Architecture with a concertration in Urban Design from Cal Poly, san Luis Obispo. I've toiled variously and called San Francisco home through a number of economic and population ups and downs. I think the current upzoning plans under consideration are too extreme, and will result in the displacement of existing businesses and renters that may not have a subsequent round of luck regarding housing or business endeavors. Vancouver, Canada undertook similar upzoning ideas, and the result was merely more and more luxury housing and or pied a terres, and the last time I checked some of the recently built luxury highrises in San Francisco aren't necessarily selling like hotcakes anymore anyway, so even more luxury housing seems less ideal.

An urban designer and professor from Vancouver suggested one solution is to make potential developments less dense and tall, and require a percentage of the new units to be available at below market rate. Often, developers can make money on new projects with a few concessions, it's just that their boatload of profit would be smaller. I don't think a smaller profit boat is too great a burden on developers.

Too, if indeed, the state government is brow-beating San Francisco into creating new housing asap, well, the commercial vacancy rate downtown, in the commercial core, is still at about 35%. That's one out of three square feet sitting unused. I suggest getting together development incentives for the conversion of commercial to residential, and simultaneously (maybe it would be somewhat easy for liscensed architects with a certain scope) compile a list of the manditory conversion procedures necessary (air ciruclation systems, fires egress stairwells, etc) in order for "Sally Developer" to somewhat expiditiously approach such a conversion process. The thing is, even if some of the downtown buildings are not exactly the most graceful of architectural sculptures, they are already there, and their conversions won't drastically change San Francisco's overall existing urban texture, nor destroy view corridors, nor displace businesses and tenants.

Please please be careful with upzoning. San Francisco's a neat place, and you could destroy that forever. That's in your grasp. What about more housing projects on wasted flat areas out in Hunter's Point, Mission Rock, or Dogpatch: ie, in the SE corner of the city? You really can't expect to shove 60,000 housing units out in the Richmond and have everyone there on board for the new deal. Please please think about what you're doing.

And I hate to bring this up but we're not even really talking about housing the working class can afford. People won't Bart on over to scrub toilets at the Hilton until the end of time. We need housing people in the 50k to 100k a year income bracket can afford. It's nowhere these days. And then too there's housing 8000 homeless. We really need a comprehensive housing for the future strategy and plan that includes homes for people all the way from homeless to 150k a year. Okay thanks for your time and have a great day.

Sincerely,
Mark Philpott
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | marlowekarl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marlowe Bjorklund |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:50:07 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Maintaining the architectural and cultural integrity of San Francisco is possible while also finding ways to add more housing and address issues like homelessness in our city. The need is to develop our city without becoming something we are not. We need to focus on adding more public housing and transport to allow easier access to our "working" neighborhoods. Save the city's architectural history and spirit.

Sincerely,
Marlowe Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | deniselleck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denise Selleck |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 9:52:48 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Denise Selleck
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:23:31 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
SAVE OUR CITY!  All over the world HISTORIC cities have preserved their original core, spreading out new housing in the periphery. Build in SOMA, in the Bayview, etc.
In my neighborhood ( D8 ) Duboce Park will soon be 125 years old, and we love the existing ambiance/density. Don’t ruin it!

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** meilie.wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mei Lie Wong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:33:39 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):San Francisco does not need anymore expensive high rise buildings. Do something about the empty buildings down town. If another college or school comes to the city, where are those service people, professors, students etc. going to live. Are they going to be able to afford more of the same that has already been built?

Sincerely,
Mei Lie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Clark |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:09:25 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carol Clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:16:55 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** marcimander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marcia Manderscheid
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:39:22 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I have enjoyed living in Pacific Heights for more than 50 years. Please take another look and revise this destructive plan.

Sincerely,
Marcia Manderscheid
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** merijohn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Merijohn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:45:24 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to respectfully request that you:

1) Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

2) Substantially scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps

Mayor Lurie's current housing plan will be voted on by the Planning Commission on September 11, 2025. If I were not scheduled to be away from SF that day, I would be at this meeting to offer my opposition argument in person.

I am deeply invested in San Francisco and have been for 40 years: I live here, work here, vote here, volunteer here, run businesses here. Please revisit this plan now. It is a free pass to demolish existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. There is no guarantee of substantially increasing affordable housing in this plan and this is what SF needs the most. We don't need to build more luxury high rises in the city.

Please don't let the lobbyists and politicians who stand to profit from this plan permanently disfigure and diminish the quality of life of the people who live and work here.

SF does not need to be sold out to the highest bidder for short-sighted gain. The city needs a ground-up holistic 30 year sustainability plan, not a free pass to developers to stack in more lxury condos.

Mayor Lurie's current upzoning maps will impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and over building of luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers, lobbyists and conflicted politicians who stand to gain from it. They also gag and silence the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
George Merijohn
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** mathias1us@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marcy Israel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:35:30 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The corridors scheduled to be upzoned are inappropriate and out of proportion. There are many parts of the city that can be developed with higher buildings that are not now developed. Impacting neighborhoods is not the way to provide housing. What is the purpose for example of tall buildings along Fulton Street? It is to give "park view" housing, not affordable housing.

The charm of San Francisco is in the unique architecture of neighborhoods. Tall buildings also create wind tunnels and effect t he environmment.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Marcy Israel
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** upzoneoverreachemail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vance Nesbitt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:57:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

Sincerely,
Vance Nesbitt
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** wi110w2ree@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Corey Bostrom
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:40:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The Sunset sits on top of sand dunes and limestone, too soft for a mega structure that only rich people can afford. I most certainly hope environmental impacts will be done, cause lately it seems like our so called civic leaders are circumventing that process and doing what they want. I guess it's acceptable to create many more future sinking Millennial towers all over the place? Seems nothing was learned from that debacle.

How about stop letting foreign investors buy housing they don't live in that drive up the market making it unaffordable for actual residents and citizens to buy or even rent. Very sad when my childhood friend saves her money for years to purchase a house in the City she was born and raised in, only to have a foreign investor come in and out bid her with cash. This is ridiculous, I'm all for more housing, but there has to be a better way without stealing from residents and businesses.

Overall this is an AFFORDABILITY crisis. I see for rent signs all over, just way too expensive. So let's just displace the people already living here. Take more parking spaces and driving areas away while wanting even more people to live here. Steal whole blocks of land, displace people and lie. You guys don't care or listen to anything. Your way or no way.

I'm a San Francisco native and I'm sad and disappointed at what is happening. You can't even get the homeless situation under control and now with the upzoning and future land grab even more good hard working citizens and families will be up rooted. But then again it's beginning to feel like our City politicians only want rich people to live here, might as well gate the whole City off.

Sincerely,
Corey Bostrom
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** pat.gray8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Gray
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:48:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Senator Weiner and Mayor Lurie should be fighting against these changes at the state and local levels! They are both aware that the additional housing is not needed. Our neighborhoods need to be revitalized and both the roads and Muni services improved.

Sincerely,
Patricia Gray
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Bucchioni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:45:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

San Francisco is a gem and it's character is made up of the many different neighborhoods within. Let's make sure these neighborhoods will continue to exist. The flavors and uniqueness of San Francisco are at stake. Preserve, protect, restore. Let's first focus on integrating the already approved construction for new housing and second, let's seriously look at our existing and unutilized buildings to meet the demand of affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Iris Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** upnup8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Jang
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:47:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I would be ok with this type of upzoning if you could limit it to every other block or opposite corners. If you do this and you end up with 3-4 or 5 upzoned buildings on a single block, that would change sunlight access and mess up the vibe of the Richmond District.

Sincerely,
Amy Jang
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** Ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:53:08 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:53:52 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's shameful plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Please keep the beauty and charm of San Francisco intact. Don't turn SF into another ugly high rise disaster like Vancouver! Oppose the reckless and disgraceful sellout to developers of San Francisco through upzoning!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | shorak1234@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Horak |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:16:11 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Steven Horak
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:56:48 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. Leave this old legacy neighborhoods alone. And move all of the concerts from Golden Gate Park to China Basin where there is less disruption!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** msmc5354@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of M Chin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:17:56 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): This upzoning plan will remove much of the character that makes San Francisco an historic and beautiful city. Do not accede to these unfortunate plans.

Sincerely,
M Chin

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sunsetsandy98@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandy Glover |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:43:21 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sandy Glover
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Smalley |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:58:35 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jane Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randy Mazzei
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:29:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Randy Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bobby8400@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bobby Malhotra |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:38:33 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bobby Malhotra
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** judyrobosf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Judith Robinson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:58:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose all efforts to upzone large areas of San Francisco as proposed by the Mayor and District 3 Supervisor. The proposals abrogate much public input that is critical to radical changes in the city's design and demeanor. They falsely claim that they will increase housing, which at present is readily available in many empty buildings in the city.

The results would destroy the physical beauty of a city popular for that very reason with tourists and residents alike. I am a long-time property owner in the Telegraph Hill-North Beach district and supporter of preserving historic sites - NOT demolishing them in the name of misleading claims of providing affordable housing.

Please OPPOSE ALL UPZONING plans and listen to city residents' views on the subject.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Sincerely,
Mary Judith Robinson
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:41:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.
I am a public high school teacher. The needs of the ordinary people, some of them poor, I serve are not being met by the massive upzoning that you are proposing. It benefits the developers and perhaps California senators like Scott Weiner, who is from back east, but it does not benefit children, elderly or middle-aged people in this city, and we are the people who elected you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:48:22 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):This type of thing happened in the 60's and hurt SF unimaginably. The "buck teeth" on the water, the ugly high rises on Broadway, the list goes on and on. We live in SF neighborhoods to NOT be New York, to be able to see water and greenery. If you have to build high rises, build them downtown where it's already a high rise area. This is a ridiculous plan

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bisho@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David F Bisho |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:51:46 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Gentlemen and Gentleladies:

Pls do not let this happen. Our area here, Westwood Highlands Association, a single family neighborhood, like the Planning Commission, by the way, is now over 100 years old.

It was 100 years of planning with its hard-fought and myriad of zoning designations that gave the city its culturally rich rand diverse charm that it still has.

Please do not allow this hijacking/developers dream to happen. You don't have to. I venture to say that NO resident in San Francisco wants it. Please.
Sincerely
David F Bisho, President
Westwood Highlands Association
www.Westwood Highlands.org
415-290-7267

Sincerely,
David F Bisho
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** kevin.durrance@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Durrance
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 4:03:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- Take the time to craft a plan that does not create tall walls of buildings along transit corridors with no affordability guarantee. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to map out a more dense but still livable west side.
- The current plan bisects most of the impacted blocks. The plan proposes upzoning on one side of the block while holding current heigh limits on the immediately adjacent parcels (the other half of the impacted blocks). This penalizes residents like me on those adjacent parcels. It also lowers the probability that additional housing will actually be developed due to the higher construction costs of these tall skinny building on residential sized lots.
- I understand the logic of increasing density close to public transit corridors, but the upzoning should be spread out over larger areas. That would still be within 5-10 min walks to public transit. This would actually increase the probability of new housing being built vs. the current proposal.
- The proposed plan will turn 19th Ave from Lincoln to Wawona into a walled 6 lane road. Why was the upzoning not designed to have height breaks on 19th Ave by spreading the upzoning also along the adjacent streets from Lincoln Viicente? Your proposal walls off views to the ocean for everyone east of 19th Ave.
- I support upzoning and density increases in general, but this plan does more harm than good.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Sincerely,
Kevin Durrance
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** marinamorenous@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marina Moreno
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 4:46:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have been a resident in San Francisco since 1986. I've seen a lot of change, a lot of boom and bust, and participated in a couple of the Tech ups and downs myself, as I always worked in the City.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which promotes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and local/small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I design cabinets and closets for work, so I go to EVERY SINGLE corner of the city. I have seen how dead downtown office space is, yet a lack of planning on how all this empty space can be retrofitted to low and middle income housing. The answer is not to build more, but to MAKE IMMEDIATELY ACCESSIBLE all the space that is already there, and all the homes left vacant by foreign real estate investment speculators. WHILE LOWERING THE RED TAPE for home owners who want to organically add family and friend ADUs to make existing footprint a lot more dense.

All those luxury condos are simply second homes and pied-a-terre for rich people who have their primary residence in the suburbs and want a place to crash when they come party in our town. I know this is oversimplified, but I do see it first hand every single day, as these are my clients! Few of these new folks in new apartments are middle income people, NONE are low income people. Let's be real, please.

We demand that you:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marina Moreno
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** stricker7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Raphael Stricker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:24:46 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I moved to charming San Francisco to get away from the crowds, noise and pollution of New York City. Please don't turn the charm of SF into the grit of NYC.

Sincerely,
Raphael Stricker
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** pass58@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L Chin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:49:37 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- REJECT the Mayor’s upzoning maps, that SF citizens OPPOSE
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. It is nothing but an excuse to shove destruction down the throats of every San Franciscan, while Lurie fails to address the actual problems of crime, drugs, public safety, homelessness and a worsening business environment with rational solutions.

Sincerely,
L Chin

**From:** sf21roger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Weinman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:57:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We will vote you out.

SF is for people, not VC$.

You will continue to thrive bc of your greed.

SF had a good run, until you and your VC buds.

Grow up,
RW

Sincerely,
Roger Weinman
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:24:06 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
It has been proven time and time again that renters affected by these displacements are rarely able to returned to the "new" buildings built after their exit.
This is also a "legal" strategy to eliminate rent controlled eligibility all together due to the buildings' new construction year.
Plus, there is the obvious lack of affordable inventory for renters to move to another equal living space than the one they were just forced to vacate.

Sincerely,
L. Diaz
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** danaamarisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dana Amarisa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 4:28:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No to Mayor Lurie's plan!!! -
As a San Franciso Cow Hollow resident, living in the apartment that my great-grandfather built when he heeded the call the City made to anyone with the means to please build housing after the great earthquake of 1906, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would ruin my neighborhood. It would turn my home into a tourist area with high-rises built right next to my two-story house!! This imposes permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dana Amarisa
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sbogatsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sergei Bogatsky |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:23:26 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sergei Bogatsky
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** mauberret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Raymond Mauberrrt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:04:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Native San Franciscan apauled and concerned with unreasonable hight of ongoing and Proposed building projects throughout the city .
Potentially  changing flavor and charm of this
Great city.

Sincerely,
Raymond Mauberrrt
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sebraleaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of sebra leaves |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:06:36 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
sebra leaves
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:16:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan:

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

The plans will also destroy the architectural beauty and charm of San Francisco. Beauty and charm have value. Who wants to live in a Soviet-style hell scape of concrete high rises? A childhood friend from rural Pennsylvania recently visited. She had never been to San Francisco, and she was enchanted by even my comparatively architecturally dull neighborhood -- the Richmond District. She encouraged me to work against plans that would transform my neighborhood, uglify it, and eliminate the wonderful light that permeates the northwestern avenues.

I don't mind occasional CU authorization for taller corner buildings with high percentages of affordable housing. There are plenty of such corners along Geary Boulevard that could be so transformed. But I am also concerned about small, neighborhood serving-businesses -- my grocery stores, such as Del Rio on Clement Street (formerly "El Chico"), the market on 25th and Clement, the wonderful variety of stores on Lower Clement Street, east of Park Presidio. I am concerned about my corner cafes, my nearby hardware stores, the pottery studios that have been popping up throughout the neighborhood, my bicycle shops, pet stores, stationary and gift stores such as Gables, and the Eastern European delis. We also have a rich restaurant scene here. What happens when the buildings they are in are demolished? They are unlikely to be able to afford the rent in the buildings that replace them.

When I first came to the Richmond District 35 years ago, I took the 38 Geary west on Geary Blvd when the fog was rolling in. I felt like I was in the West Coast version of Brooklyn, and I felt as if the fog were calling my name. I lived in this neighborhood ever since.

Don't destroy it.

Moreover, there is quite a bit of housing construction going on in the Richmond District. In fact, in 2020, a 12-unit condominium building opened on what had been a privately-owned parking lot one block from me. Most of the

units were not yet occupied in 2020, but at least one was occupied by a woman who had another home in San Jose. This is NOT the kind of housing that San Francisco needs. We need permanent housing for people of average income. In addition, the retail space on the ground floor remains unoccupied. What small businesses can afford the rent in these new buildings?

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** jtomkins@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Tomkins
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:15:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Clearly a rich interests power grab. There are much better solutions such as utilizing the 40k or so empty properties in SF.  It also ruins small business and neighborhood character. We are watching this and aware how right wing $$$ SF politics really is and we will resist this strongly!

Sincerely,
James Tomkins
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** sourcherrycomics@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leah Morrett
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:50:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

As a small business owner in an impacted area, my business which serves the Mission District and more specifically a historically marginalized and underserved community (LGBTQ+, BIPOC), I am especially concerned for the impact that this will have on our community as it will displace my business and many residents in this community- including myself and my wife who also received this notice at our personal address. This is a major sellout to developers and greedy real estate lobby at the expense of our most vulnerable community members. Long term residents of working class background and elderly residents who have lived in their rent controlled apartments are at risk, and we cannot afford the “market rate” housing that will spring up at rates subject to the whims of greedy landlords.

The loss of my business and the many other small businesses that are in these areas will be a huge blow to the culture and community in this city- which is the very reason that people move here and visit this beautiful city to begin with.

This rezoning plan will have long lasting effects that will destroy the vibrant and diverse culture of this city, or what is left of it. This is a sell out to greed and monied interests that will leave San Francisco a lifeless husk of beige and grey.

Sincerely,
Leah Morrett
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** mollye303@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Molly Bodrato Gentile
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:22:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We moved to the Outer Sunset as a happy medium between city and suburban living. The taller buildings currently under construction have already changed the skyline and impacted parking for those of us who have no choice but to use personal vehicles. Mayor Laurie is doing an amazing job bringing this city back to life and this would be tarnishing what I'm sure will be an incredible legacy.

Therefor, as a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Molly Bodrato Gentile
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** kduffy217@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Duffy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 2:07:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (I grew up in Manhattan and saw first hand what gentrification and indiscriminate development can do to a city. Rents become unaffordable for most people leading to a massive exit of families causing,among other things, deterioration of public schools and so much more. These were the reasons I moved to San Francisco and now I’m witnessing it happening again. Please learn from the mistake of others.

Sincerely,
Karen Duffy
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | MARYROSS.ILLUSTRATOR@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY ROSS |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 2:37:13 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MARY ROSS
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of n d
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 3:01:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
n d
San Francisco, CA 94110

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lauralou.sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Mulcrevy |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 5:47:40 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): West Portal is already congested and there is no parking even now. I couldnt even imagine adding these buildings and the damage, traffic nightmares and  gridlock it will cause.

Sincerely,
Laura Mulcrevy
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:24:39 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a longtime San Francisco resident and renter of an apartment I cannot afford to leave, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I write to call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | swissheidi67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Heidi Bumann-Stucky |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:30:48 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a NATIVE San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

West Portal has always been known for its quaint shops. You will definitely destroy it’s charm by allowing this rezoning. It is a disgrace to dishonor the history, elegance, grace and charisma of an amazing part of San Francisco. We cherish West Portal. It means a lot to our neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Heidi Bumann-Stucky
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | erinkcronin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Cronin |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:53:24 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I especially oppose the demolition of rent controlled buildings. I live in one and I work in education and would not be able to afford to live in San Francisco without rent control.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erin Cronin
San Francisco, CA 94117

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | tap4403@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of terry perrin |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:29:59 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
terry perrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | gjnear2001@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of gary near |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:32:39 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
gary near
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** dedemac56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ashley McDevitt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 7:13:38 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am a homeowner in miraloma park and was born and raised in the sunset district. West Portal as you know is full of small businesses that I would sorely miss if they were disappeared. Please don’t allow our communities to succumb to the developers who want to build up so high with empty store fronts.

Sincerely,
Ashley McDevitt
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | barbarajroos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Roos |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 8, 2025 9:36:10 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Roos
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** lowell.nicholson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lowell Nicholson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 11:44:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

As a long term Sunset resident, I fear that these upzoning proposals will drastically change the neighborhood I love. I worry that upzoning will displace friends, neighbors, and businesses, and forever alter what makes this part of San Francisco so special.

Please please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Lowell Nicholson
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 12:52:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes & historic buildings, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. San Francisco is unique with its beautiful vistas for the public to enjoy, not just the chosen few. Height limits are necessary to stop greedy developers.

Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Such catering to the rich developers is disgusting.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please do not ruin the city!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland

**From:** wei.kong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wei Kong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 2:03:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
It is disappointing that the city officials again put its residents interests last. What the citizens need the most is reducing crime, homelessness and bring back businesses and tourism. Turning San Francisco into Miami beach is the last thing to bring back tourism.

Sincerely,
Wei Kong
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | fentco@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Douglas Fenton |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 8, 2025 2:06:20 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Douglas Fenton
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | charis44@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Valentine |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 8, 2025 2:23:53 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Catherine Valentine
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** matt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew McGuinness
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 2:26:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a 3rd generation San Franciscan, please don't destroy the neighborhood I've enjoyed all of my life.

Sincerely,
Matthew McGuinness
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | anniek092000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of A Saxe |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 8, 2025 3:05:01 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
A Saxe

**From:** judyt2009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Tomsic
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 3:35:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I am tired of Scott Weiner making demands on San Francisco that are unrealistic when public transit and other limited resources are taken into account. Nothing in the upzone plan requires Muni to continue providing the transit lines that define a "transit corridor". And nothing in the plan requires builders to get started on already approved projects. Of course they don't mind waiting for more favorable interest rates and rental markets, as Assemblyman Weiner rewards them and penalizes our city if the housing does not get built!

Please stop this madness and design a plan that is both by and for San Franciscans of all income levels. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judy Tomsic
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** richnavro2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Navarro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 11:50:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Navarro
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** richnavro2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Navarro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 8, 2025 11:52:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Navarro
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** rosenewton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Newton
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 7:03:26 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I feel this plan will not benefit anyone but the developers and ruin the character of our city.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** coreycatt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY MARCH
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:02:44 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Historic neighborhoods like Westwood Highlands were designed for single family occupancy with distinct architecture. Building high-rises here would ruin that. They should be built in places that make sense, like transportation corridors along places like West Portal and similar instead of destroying historic neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
MARY MARCH
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** lisa.arjes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Arjes
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:06:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The state mandate is an all-size-fits-one proposal that just doesn't work as it doesn't address the actual problem of affordability. San Francisco doesn't have a problem with supply as much as it has a problem with affordability. This is not a simple Econ 101 problem. Look at Vancouver. Vancouver tried to build their way out of a similar problem. Prices are still astronomically high.

Sincerely,
Lisa Arjes
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Max Ferman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:07:50 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I am terrified of losing my home and apartment of 30 years.
I am retired from UCSF, and will have nowhere else to go.
Please protect us.

Sincerely,
Max Ferman
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** disp006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrence McKenna
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:53:34 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optionalThere is plenty of room for new housing at the end of Geneva Ave and where the old Schlegel lock factory was. This would revitalize that part of the city. The weather is better on this side of town much less fog and more sunshine. Why destroy existing neighborhoods when there is plenty of room to build on the sunny side of the city. Some might say this is a rundown part of the city all the more reason to revitalize this area. Don’t ruin good neighborhoods. The Sunset , Westwood Park and Monterey Heights should be left alone these are great neighborhoods that do not need to change.

Sincerely,
Terrence McKenna
San Francisco, CA 94112

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Ryan Andrade |
| **To:** | CPC.SF.Housing.Choice |
| **Cc:** | Chen, Lisa (CPC); Yalon, Anne (CPC); Garcia, David (CPC); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Full support for Rezoning |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:10:26 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My partner and I recently moved to San Francisco and are happy new residents of the city and of district 8. You have our full support for the rezoning efforts to increase housing supply in San Francisco!

The process of finding a place to live was extremely difficult due to constrained supply and high demand. We are lucky that we found a place to fit our budget.

We love San Francisco and any hope of affordably renting or owning a place in the city depends on decisions like this to continually grow the city's housing supply!

Thank you,
Ryan Andrade

**From:** pariscp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paris Paraskeva
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:37:00 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.  This plan will do nothing to address the affordable housing problem in San Francisco

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Paris Paraskeva
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** cdoyle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Doyle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:32:30 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: My family has lived in the West Portal area for more than 80 years. There is a neighborhood quality here that keeps us in San Francisco and supportive of our communities. The upzoning maps will destroy the look, neighborhood feel and the resulting community on this side of the city. We live here because we don't have the high rises and the bustle of downtown. We know and spend time with our neighbors. This is a special part of San Francisco that is unique and should remain that way.

Sincerely,
Catherine Doyle
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** andrew.hamill@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Hamill
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:44:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrew Hamill
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | lorenjjones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Loren Jones |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 9, 2025 11:13:34 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Mayor Lurie,
My wife and I met you in Noe Valley before the election and told you you were going to win. We are native San Franciscans, we love our city, and we ask you to protect our neighborhoods.
Thank you,
Loren Jones

Sincerely,
Loren Jones
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | pedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 9, 2025 2:27:35 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I live at 576 Church Street at 18th. Church Street is one of the streets that will be most affected by the proposed upzoning plan. People like living in this neighborhood because it's built on a human scale, which this plan will completely subvert. It will do little to provide reasonably priced housing, force people out of existing housing, overburden the infrastructure, and destroy the character of a city that earns a lot of money as a place tourists want to visit.

I urge you to scale this plan back drastically and find a more measured, step-by-step approach to the issue.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | nanville@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Armenta |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:13:09 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SF Voters WILL REMEMBER...

Sincerely,
Joe Armenta
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | ga366@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Moran |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:41:41 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Gary Moran
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** mariannelhowell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marianne Howell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:19:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My whole family was born and raised in San Francisco. My mom was born and raised in North Beach, dad was born and raised in the Richmond district and my brother, sister and myself were born and raised in the Sunset district. We all went to school here. The mayors plan will ruin the city my family and I love. No one wants to look out their window and see giant buildings surrounding their home. These new buildings will just be eyesores throughout the city. People will lose the views they may have had. This is a horrible idea. It is not the right way to correct the housing situation.  The city will look like there are projects all over the city. It will not beautify the neighborhoods around the city. Tall buildings belong downtown, not in the neighborhoods.
Please don’t move forward with this awful plan which will ruin our city.

Sincerely,
Marianne Howell
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** judgold22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Goldstein
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:00:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Goldstein
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | jamielee6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jamie Wong |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:32:07 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jamie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** kellydanp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dan Kelly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 9, 2025 11:32:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Forest Hill and as a San Franciscan, I strongly endorse the overdue efforts to build more housing throughout the city, which has frozen housing expansion for decades, driving many families out of the city.

The proposal to utilize vacant plots along Laguna Honds Boulevard from Lawton Street is a no-brainer,
But this is a heaviy used and high-speed artery. Plans must include attention to pedestrian safety, adequate off-street parking, and increased MUNI service for the additional population.

Thje proposed development woukd be enhanced by rehabilitating the neglected open space to the north of Laguna Honda, so that it could be used for walking, birdwatching , etc.

Sincerely,
Dan Kelly
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | thanos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Athanassios Diacakis |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 10, 2025 5:28:50 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

You generally seemed to have lost the plot and are going with "more is better" rather than thinking through what you want to achieve.

More housing is not going to make cheaper housing... It's just going to make *more* housing.  Look at NYC as an example.

You're just following the developer and YIMBY narrative and just plowing ahead with this silliness.

It's one thing to cause a bunch of destruction and achieve something, and a wholly different thing to create the same destruction and achieve nothing... which is where we are headed.

It's sad.

Sincerely,
Athanassios Diacakis
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** royacary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cary Sunshine
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 10, 2025 7:37:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful actions that our residents and your constituents can feel proud to have supported. This is not a win for San Francisco, it's as if it's the 60s; and we are being told we need super highways running through town. Please prevent our city from turning into a view less and overbuilt eye sore. Maybe we should have a vote?

Sincerely,
Cary Sunshine
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** coynesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cynthia Coyne
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:15:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Stop destroying what makes San Francisco a unique and desirable place to live. Mayor Lurie's plan will destroy the distinct character of our city and what drew my husband and I to move to District 7 thirty five years ago. There are already too many architecturally bereft monstrosities popping up in our neighborhoods, making SF no different from the cookie-cutter communities around the country. No wonder people are leaving, we are quickly losing our charm. Shame on you all for allowing this to happen. History will remember you!!!!!

San Franciscans deserve better!!! Families deserve better!!! Small businesses deserve better!!! You have over-stepped and you no longer serve the neighborhoods you represent, especially Supervisor Melgar!!!

We call on you to:
- stop hiding behind Scott Weiner's crappy bill and step up to defend our city
- stop re-zoning our neighborhoods. The Mayor's 'up-zoning' maps fast track our city's decline
- postpone the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- stop prioritizing real estate investors and developers
- start representing SF's small business and families for a change

We all want to see San Francisco thrive but this is NOT the way to do it. You should be ashamed!

Sincerely,
Cynthia Coyne
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Christian Williams |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:54:52 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

~Christian J. Williams
District 6 Voting Resident

**From:** jlm211h@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josine LaMonica
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:53:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I grew up in this neighborhood from the 60's to the 80's I still own my childhood home. This rezoning would destroy the area... surrounding areas like West Portal or Portola are commercial areas Forest Hills is a family neighborhood. Doing this would impact the family's and deeply change the demographic. Think hard about what you are doing, and not about the MONEY...

Sincerely,
Josine LaMonica
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** MICHAEL_DORF@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Dorf
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:59:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This is particularly problematic given the the bait and switch on the Covid-era street closures, which have now become permanent over the opposition of the majority of local district residents.  If the City wants to add more more housing capacity, at a minimum all "Slow Streets" and the Upper Great Highway need to be reopened in order to handle the increased traffic that will result from this additional housing.

Sincerely,
Michael Dorf
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** gbirsinl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Birsinger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 10, 2025 4:02:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco homeowner, I'm writing to express my serious concerns about the proposed rezoning that would allow 8-story buildings in single-family neighborhoods.

I'm not against addressing our housing shortage, but this plan feels like it's solving the wrong problem in the wrong way. First, the required housing numbers don't even account for the thousands of units already approved but not yet built. Why are we rushing to rezone when we haven't even seen what impact those existing approvals will have?

My bigger concern is what happens after we approve this. If affordable housing is truly the goal, where are the guarantees? How do we ensure these new buildings won't just become luxury condos that make our affordability crisis worse? I haven't seen any binding requirements or long-term oversight plans that would prevent this.

The height limit changes also seem to be painted with too broad a brush. Some areas might make sense for increased density, but others clearly don't - yet the maps don't seem to distinguish between them. You can't just draw lines on a map and call it good planning.
What really worries me is that this feels like it's setting up our neighborhoods for massive demolition and displacement of the people and small businesses that make these communities what they are. Once we make these zoning changes, they're permanent. But the January 2026 deadline feels arbitrary and rushed for something this consequential.
I'm asking you to:

Scale back these upzoning maps significantly and make them more targeted
Push for extending that deadline so we can do this right
Require real, enforceable affordability commitments, not just hopes and promises

We all want more housing, but let's make sure we're building for San Franciscans, not just for whoever can afford luxury towers. This deserves more thoughtful planning than what I'm seeing right now.

Sincerely,
Laura Birsinger
San Francisco, CA 94132

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | noble.angulo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sabine Angulo |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 10, 2025 5:49:03 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sabine Angulo
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | minnettelehmann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Minnette Lehmann |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 10, 2025 6:15:08 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Minnette Lehmann

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sbogatsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sergei Bogatsky |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 10, 2025 11:33:39 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sergei Bogatsky
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** bconnormurphy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Murphy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 8:04:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan I have seen the City change over the decades and I understand the desire and need to make the City better. These upzoning ideas are prepared to destroy the diversity of neighborhoods the City offers. Not all of SF needs to be or should be high density. no one wants that. Additionally, the 3 projects on the West Side are all very close to each other and on a congested 7th Ave corridor. How these projects would pass an EIR is beyond imagination but I am sure the City will waive the EIR to let them proceed. Should we abolish all planning rules for everyone so that it is fair or will we work to destroy our cherished neighborhoods with high density only?

Please think of the permanent impacts of these plans. once destroyed neighborhoods can never recover. San Francisco's beauty is in part the diversity of housing options and single family neighborhoods.

We have all inherited a beautiful and vibrant City, we should endeavor to preserve what we love for future generations. Do not be a part of the group takes away the City's charm.

Sincerely,
Brian Murphy
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** maryvolkov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary VOLKOV
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 9:42:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary VOLKOV
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** robintoschi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Toschi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 11:10:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a third generation San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
My family of Italian immigrants came here before the 1907 earthquake. We’ve never been wealthy, but we’ve always tried to make a positive impact on the City. My great grandfather helped found the crab fisherman’s association. My grandparents owned a well respected restaurant in North Beach.

Our neighborhoods have helped to make the City a special place to live and visit, helping to preserve the different groups that define it. I have lived in West Portal for 50 years and am proud to have seen it grow and change. However, I’m afraid that these zoning changes would so negatively impact our neighborhoods (not just West Portal) that they would lose the individuality that gives the City its identity.

Sincerely,
Robin Toschi
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Harvey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 1:20:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): These changes to 65' and 85' will take away the views we currently have for construction along 15th ave and the area in and around Taraval and Ulloa Sts. We barely have a view of the Farallon Islands and any height additions take that away entirely along with areas toward Lake Merced and Fort Funston. In addition even if the areas are along transit corridors, the current maps continue the area on Taraval to between Funston and Forest Side Aves. These do not have transit on the Taraval East of 15th Ave. That should be an area that is definitely removed if the criteria stated is followed. To add context as I have lived in and around this area for all of my 68 years and finished my City employment career as the Fire Marshal for the San Francisco Fire Department. I still work assisting Moscone Convention Center with fire and life safety as a part time employee. Most people I know are not against housing done in a scale and location that does not ruin the character of neighborhoods nor ruin enjoyment of these areas by changes so different than when we moved to or within these neighborhoods. The concept of few people having vehicles because little or no parking is required for these large developments that will make those developers wealthy does nothing for existing San Franciscans. People will visit these new tenants and park everywhere while increasing traffic and making it less safe for children and the elderly specifically. I have seen hundreds of stop signs and tens of signals installed of the years with many most recently. I have not stayed in San Francisco and raised my family to see the neighborhoods become more windy with little sun and lower quality of life. Many have moved from San Francisco and I do not want to be among them so please change these requirements and do not continue with the excuse of the State mandate. Housing can be built without these drastic changes to these neighborhoods.Areas around Lake Merced have apartment buildings with land adjacent where additional housing in taller buildings could be constructed without affecting the views and traffic as much as would be done with these current proposals. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Thomas Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** thdrift@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Darin Rosas
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 3:56:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This will decrease the quality of life for already financially struggling families in SF with higher costs, less resources in a densely populated area, increased power outages with more strain on the grid, more crime, more economic division, more traffic, no affordable requirements, horrible for the environment & filling the developers pockets that most aren't even local.
Newsome & Weiner will have a very tarnished reputation after these projects, we ask you to make a difference & just say no to this type of development.  Please demand a more methodical approach instead of this slapped & crammed approach.  It didn't go well for Engardio nor will it bode well for any other politician supporting it..

Sincerely,
Darin Rosas
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** rgoodman311@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Goodman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 4:56:49 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Robert Goodman
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** tompacko@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Packo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 10:54:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long-term San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods with unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I ask that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Sincerely,
Tom Packo
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** holyvo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Holy Vo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:09:46 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan of many years in this beautiful city, I'm writing to ask you strongly reconsider Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

What keeps me and many others who love these neighborhoods in San Francisco is the balance of close knit community and vibrant city living, and though we support the development of housing to accommodate the city's growing needs, this plan goes far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

I hope you will listen to the voices of the impacted communities while building a strong path forward for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Holy Vo
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | echernyak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eddy Chernyak |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:16:48 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Eddy Chernyak
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:55:09 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:55:58 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:56:59 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | judigorski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Gorski |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:57:13 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you in advance for hopefully considering the needs of our community and supporting our position.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | hawaiian4life@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vincent Arroyo |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:07:53 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Vincent Arroyo
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | moonstar77@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Arias |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:10:18 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carolyn Arias
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** kielykids@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaVive Kiely
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:16:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

How the heck do developers and the City expect to come into ownership of this land?! This smells an awful lot like the scandals of Redevelopment in the 60's and 70's when owners of properties South of Market and in the Fillmore were given a pittance for their properties. Most of the African Americans who lived there were never able to come back. My father fought losing his properties South of Market for YEARS! He grew up in one of those houses. His very elderly mother libed in the other. He was given $55K for 2 houses and a lot!

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** chloeewallis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Chloe Wallis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:17:56 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Chloe Wallis

**From:** sarahvberman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Voynow-Berman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:19:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): there has not been an environmental study YET on sewage treatment, building in sand dunes and overcrowding which is unsustainable near an ocean.
Build DOWNTOWN first. I don't see any supervisor or Weiner admitting that this drastic, knee jerk action would harm their neighborhood. Get big corporations to stop buying  up properties to turn them into) to high rent or short term rentals which further erodes our community. Do that FIRST

Sincerely,
Sarah Voynow-Berman
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** forrestbice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Forrest Bice
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:27:00 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a young person living and working in San Francisco I'm writing to you to break any preconceived notion that young people want more housing in San Francisco but even more importantly that we also can see that demand will always outstrip supply in this beautiful city we call home. More housing is _not_ a real-world solution to affordability in already dense areas and we have seen plenty of examples of that play out with severe and tragic consequences. You can only ruin a city once as they say and that's true! Manhattanization is not made up, it's a reality and it can and will happen in SF unless we act to protect our city; don't be duped or bullied into the narrative pro-housing advocates are spewing. San Francisco is beautiful and vibrant because of the way it is. I repeat: __You Can Only Ruin A City Once___

Sincerely,
Forrest Bice
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | cablecar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wesley Valaris |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:40:11 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: DONT LET THE DEVELOPERS TAKE OVER. This is our town and this madness has got to end. There is a reason we love our neighborhoods and San Francisco.  It is simply because of its small neighborhood/town feel. Look at every neighborhood and city that has fallen under the spell of bought paid for politicians. Every project has ruined its city for the enriching of a few. At what point do we disallow the greedy power grab to continue.

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | asmtoyou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Mc Manus |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 3:41:16 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Mc Manus
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | francesca_long@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Francesca Long |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:11:51 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): My family and my husband's family have worked long and hard to build lives here in the Sunset. Please do not turn these neighborhoods into endless massive apartment buildings. It does not create more affordable housing and simply forces people out. It simply destroys neighborhoods. There are other areas in the city that are vacant and can be bullt up! We will need to spend money to build out transit to those areas but it will be better spent rather than destroying existing neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Francesca Long
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | stefano@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stefano Carissimo |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:36:44 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Stefano Carissimo
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** justinreplys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Dumas
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 5:04:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Justin Dumas
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** mshapiro49@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marni Shapiro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:54:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marni Shapiro
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | tworose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bethellen Levitan |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:06:06 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bethellen Levitan
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | tworose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Levitan |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:06:26 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Beth Levitan
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** elyse.aylward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elyse Aylward
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 6:20:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please do not ruin my neighborhood with large multi-unit buildings. I have lived here for 67 years and I do not want more people. It's already too crowded with cars since you closed the Great Highway. Find another way. Turn all the empty office buildings downtown into housing and stay out of the Sunset neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Elyse Aylward
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:53:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have lived in the Sunset for over 40 years and have seen many changes. For the most part they have been positive and I feel the neighborhood has benefitted from the gradual development. My grown children continue to reside here and raise their children in the Sunset too. We love the neighborhood.

However, this Upzoning Plan is disturbing in that it allows massive development and doesn't really address the affordability issues we have in SF. In addition, there are already approved plans for big developments in SF that haven't even started (!)

Please don't allow this extreme upzoning.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** 415irisheyes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Faliano
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:03:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The attack on the Sunset community is criminal. The Sunset has always been a quiet sleepy beach neighborhood. There is not a housing shortage in SF to be building such large scale, out of character buildings, there is an affordability issue. Plus the Sunset does not have the infrastructure for multiple building units nor the parking no thanks to the SFMTA.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Faliano
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** timothy.ryan151@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Ryan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:12:16 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We have been property owners since 2004, and we dont want to see our already crowded city become more overrun, services and infrastructure overtaxed, and businesses forced to leave the city to avoid this craziness.  Please be mindful, seek reasonable growth where able, and invest in the future by taking care of what we have now, not building more only to get trampled by the congestion and overgrowth.  Thank you for your time

Sincerely,
Timothy Ryan
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bailey.kathyr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Bailey |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:36:49 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan living in neighboring Haight, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kathy Bailey
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:08:40 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I fear this will make more residents of San Francisco homeless ... right at the time it's becoming illegal to be unhoused. I may well be one of them. I'm a disabled senior living on a fixed income and if the owner of my building decides to demolish the building I live in to upzone to a larger building I will be out. I cannot afford to move to another apartment. I will be homeless at age 72. I do not support the mayors plan for more housing. There must be a better way.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | anthony@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Mazzei |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:37:30 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): This only makes more traffic, more litter, noise and other issues. We are already dense with touching houses. We already share walls. This is one of the few places in the city we can still raise families.

Sincerely,
Anthony Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | karenmillerwood@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Wood |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:21:44 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
It appears that California has been bought and paid for by the building sector, whose chief advocate is Senator Wiener. San Francisco's population "is currently declining at a rate of -2.6% annually and its population has decreased by -11.78% since the most recent census, which recorded a population of 870,518 in 2020." [https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/california/san-francisco]. What justiifies the Mayor's extremist Upzoning Plan and its devastation of San Francisco's unique neighborhoods? If upzoning is such an excellent idea, put it before the voters and find out how they feel about the massive changes proposed for their city.

Sincerely,
Karen Wood
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** informationmistress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lori H
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:57:40 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I've been a resident and homeowner in San Francisco for over 35 years, living in District 2, District 4 and now District 6. Of course, I understand there's a homeless and affordable housing crisis in my beloved city, but taking away local residents' control and say over neighborhood zoning, building heights and development in deference to developers and billionaires is the exact opposite of what San Franciscans need.

Sincerely,
Lori H
San Francisco, CA 94103

**From:** sffred@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fred McFadden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:08:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 49 year San Francisco resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This upzoning plan will not lower housing costs. It will ruin the charm of our neighborhoods. It will increase commercial rents, and discourange small business and local independent restaurants.
Entrepreneurs of all kinds, small boutiques, art galleries, restaurants, and business will not be able to afford to open and sustain their businesses.
Please don’t Manhatten-ize the Sunset.

Sincerely,
Fred McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:13:33 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** food-mimosas.01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R Curry
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 14, 2025 10:14:24 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Forest Hill is one of the few historic neighborhoods that must be protected. Converting residential zones to commercial zones is a huge mistake.

Sincerely,
R Curry
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** patriciacalfee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Calfee Picache
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:24:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan.

This is a mistake and one that will greatly impact our neighborhoods and quality of life. Having grown up in San Francisco, and now choosing to raise my own three young children here, I am disappointed to see the Mayor taking such ill-planned action.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps

- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Patricia Calfee Picache
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | picache@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ian Picache |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 14, 2025 3:03:04 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Ian Picache
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | samanthamostovoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Samantha Mostovoy |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:43:41 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Samantha Mostovoy
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, August 15, 2025 7:01:05 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for your time and consideration - protecting the character of our city is critical.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | fraley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fraley |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 15, 2025 9:59:53 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Fraley
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 16, 2025 9:14:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I encourage the Mayor to watch a recording of the June public meeting, where many voices discussed clearly, and interesting, uniquely how detrimental the current rezoning plan would be, causing more harm than good.

The current plan to simultaneously upzone 13,000 acres of SF is reckless and does not address affordable housing.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Why doesn't the City focus on getting vacant properties (40,000 vacant homes in SF, not including the growing amount of unoccupied commercial space) occupied? The City can encourage/incentivize landlords with vacant/derelict properties to update and make them available — if vacant, mandate extra taxes; if it remains vacant mandate a rent cap for affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** zamarripamaz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Anne Zamarripa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 16, 2025 6:43:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a Native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Mayor Lurie, I had the pleasure of meeting you when you had supported the group re The Boulevard (Sunset).
I was hopeful, excited, engaged everyone I met to make sure that they knew your name and to make sure they got out to vote!
Even when people brought up your background (financially) it was an easy response…Lurie comes from money which WORKS for us! He won't be swayed OR bought!" That resonated with people.

I request that this 'zoning' issue be seriously and not destroy the fabric of our neighborhood.
As you know, there are many, many buildings downtown. Use them. Yes I know they would need renovation…and the deep pocket 'developers' won't make their money, however, renovations would employ so many of our Bay Area people.

Think, think, think…about us, the people who believe in and voted for you. I'm counting on you!
As one Native to Another.
maz
415.987.3550

Sincerely,
Mary Anne Zamarripa
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** rachaeltauber@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rachael Tauber
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 17, 2025 4:46:37 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rachael Tauber
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** comradeknick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicholas Fay
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 17, 2025 11:18:04 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Fay
San Francisco, CA 94102

**From:** cfjohnso27@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Connie J
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 17, 2025 12:14:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I live in the Sunset district and this plan threatens our family-friendly community in order to blatantly benefit big developers and tech investors. Please try to make San Francisco a city for everyone — not just the super rich.

Sincerely,
Connie J
San Francisco, CA 94122

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Monday, August 18, 2025 1:48:11 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** zarina.issac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zarina Issac
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 18, 2025 2:42:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please stop with unaffordability. The free market won’t fix this!!

Sincerely,
Zarina Issac
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kbaum88@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Daniela Kirshenbaum
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 18, 2025 2:53:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Why are you giving away our city to developers? They aren't city planners. They certainly don't build for affordability.

This proposal, which nobody in city government including the Department of City Planning seems to have any problem with, proves the naysayers right about "neoliberals."

Sacramento also wanted to build a freeway through the Golden Gate Park panhandle. How does that sound now? Like Sacramento still has all the answers? If so, then why do we need a Dept. of City Planning at all?

The ultra-capitalist, trickle-down economics of "let the market solve the problem" displays some poorly hidden greed, I'm afraid. And that is certainly not helping with the adorable "Family Zoning" brand...

Sincerely,
Daniela Kirshenbaum
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** tkpassat97@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tim Keefe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 18, 2025 8:29:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,
My family has lived in San Francisco for over 100 years. Blue collar, middle class, hard-working, elastic, intelligent, ready to change careers based on the environment and jobs available, kind, with strongly held beliefs that you give back as a duty to your community and country.
My family worked very hard to be able to live in an area that is safer, quieter, and more connected. Forest Hill.
Born and raised obviously, I have friends from hunters point, the Fillmore, the Mission, family in the sunset, and all over. Growing up my friends who had section 8 housing couldn't even trust their neighbors, they would get stolen from constantly, and when people can't afford what is around them, they resort to criminality in many cases.
Putting this type of housing on Laguna Honda, where are these people going to shop? Tower market? Where are they going to eat? Everything around these areas is tailored for people in middle class and upper middle-class surroundings. We worked hard to live in these areas. You're going to set these people up for failure.
Theft is barely even reported nowadays in San Francisco, every time I go to the store I still see it. I never saw it ever for years on end growing up in the city.
Putting people sandwiched between Forest Hill, West portal, UCSF, Twin Peaks, Saint Francis Wood is not setting low income folks up for success.
I volunteered with CASA, Saint Vincents home for boys, little children's aid, as did my parents before me for decades. Ask them what will happen.
San Francisco has some problems all right, but these problems require intervention way before housing issues. We live in the western banking capital of the US, the tech capital of the US, yet we graduate people or barely graduate people who can do math, who have a little understanding of what career opportunities exist in this SMALL CITY.
I fear these are Band-Aid fixes.
In your desperation to quell loud minority voices, minority in number, you are overreaching it seems on where you are putting housing, what zoning tactics you are using, what type of economics are at play, and how communities that have been around for nearly 100 years will be affected. We are the ones that make San Francisco run. I own a company that deals with ballot initiatives, referendums, I do candid work, I know better than most.
I urge you to take these things seriously, this location is not where this type of housing needs to be.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Tim Keefe
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | nleong777@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norman Leong |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:50:14 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Norman Leong
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** irinakitrar68@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Irina Kitrar
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:37:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Irina Kitrar
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lizajalalian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liza Jalalian |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:00:58 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Liza Jalalian
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lizajalalian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liza Jalalian |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:01:16 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Liza Jalalian
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** randaghnaim@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randa Ghnaim
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:54:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randa Ghnaim
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** ho.robt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Ho
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:28:34 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Ho
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** klschulkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of karen schulkin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:29:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I live on a corner that could be demolished and converted and the image of how this would make the neighborhood look is just unimaginable. This is a very bad idea and I am not in support.

Sincerely,
karen schulkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** hulaladog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Toni Hur
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:07:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Toni Hur
San Francisco, CA 94116

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | morrison.donna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Morrison |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, August 22, 2025 9:41:14 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

FIFTY YEARS I've owned and lived in my Gough Street Victorian

and FIFTY years I've worked hard to keep my neighborhood a REAL neighborhood.

The deal you and like officials have made with the land speculators and developers and lobbyists will NOT help FAMILIES afford to live in this City...and it will only degrade these neighborhoods you have targeted for up-zoning.

Money is the voice that speaks now...not those of us who live here and pay taxes here and voted for you.

I say it is a sham and a disgrace to your office.

Shame on you.

Sincerely,
Donna Morrison
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** Vincent Casey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:30:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Vincent Casey
vinmcasey@gmail.com
1441 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** gingerpepper@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ginger Pepper
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 23, 2025 4:26:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have lived now for over 60 years throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods, especially when as a single mother it was affordable, and that is what is so special about San Francisco. I've traveled to many cities throughout the world, but San Francisco has a character neighborhood community like no other. However, it has become out of reach for the average American worker, single mother, especially the American dream of buying a home here in the city. I have seen SF change many times culturally and economically, but present day zoning deregulations are changing the intimate community/culture of San Francisco. I live in the sunset most of my life, children went to Herbert Hoover, McAteer high school, riding Muni through out the city. Building anything more than 4-12 stories becomes intrusive to the residents blocking the infamous Sunset views we are known for. I voted for mayor Lurie because he promised to restore the city to become a city for all of us and he was going to make it more affordable. Rezoning and destroying homes is not making real estate affordable. This is not Newport Beach. Our dictates otherwise.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional

Sincerely,
Ginger Pepper
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** andrewchou90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Chou
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, August 23, 2025 8:25:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Forest Hill has been my home neighborhood since I was born, it's a peaceful oasis for residents, in contrast to busy downtown. It's suburban streets, nature, and calmness creates an escape for many commuters who work in busy cities. This new plan of transforming out neighborhoods would be absolutely detrimental to the original residents of Forest Hill. These types of projects historically have never worked, and have turned the original neighborhoods into under-resourced wastelands- take Detroit for example. We beg of you, to please not push forward with this project and preserve our beautiful neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Andrew Chou
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Jordan Enriquez
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:53:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jordan Enriquez
pst.atev94@gmail.com
164 Hartford St
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** Michael Curtian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:59:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Michael Curtian
hi.im.mikey@gmail.com
650 Alvarado St, Apt 203
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** irinakitrar68@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Irina Kitrar
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 24, 2025 12:10:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

I've been living in the outer Richmond and regularly visiting the sunset for the last 26 years, and there is a legitimate reason this community feels an immediate threat from these potential plans - it directly affects the quality of living and safety that has been so precious to us in this area, without any positive or desired outcomes for it's residents. We want to still be able to see the sun and sky from anywhere on the sidewalk. We don't want corridors of 10, or even 6 story buildings. We don't want to displace people from their homes even if its "temporary." We don't want to kill small local business. And we don't trust you to deliver actual low-income housing in these developments, particularly when there is no guarantee of that outcome.

Sincerely,
Irina Kitrar
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** rglogau@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Glogau
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, August 24, 2025 4:12:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

The upcoming upcoming plan will profoundly affect the neighborhood appearance and effect a loss of open space, a commodity that has become a diminishing entity as the developers fight over the few open parcels left in the city. As anyone can see from the new construction on Stanyan Street, the aesthetics will likely be more aligned with the inhuman designs associated with the housing blocs of the former Soviet Union rather than something compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods. These projects will further contribute to the traffic congestion along 7th avenue and will never return to tolerable levels.
If the city must comply with the mandates imposed by the State of California, then make use of the empty spaces in the defunct and derelict commercial zones in the city, e.g., the Sixth street corridor or the abandoned Westfield Mall, or the run down business sites in the South of Market area. Do not pretend that you represent the best iinterests of the residents of the West Side by shoving this down their throats.

Sincerely,
Richard Glogau
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Nadav Wichmann
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Sunday, August 24, 2025 7:42:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

To whose eyes may glance at this letter-

Thank you for all you do, as I do believe the public sector is an honorable and just service, of which is not always understood.

That being said, I am writing in support of this specific idea for more housing (Family Zoning Plan). To be frank, I wish I could voice my support more concretely, but policy writing is confusing to me and I am unfortunately- both a rather slow reader and a busy individual. I am supporting this plan, because I think it supports my hopes and aspirations for San Francisco as a city, but in case I am wrong let me write my aims here.

I moved to the city just 6 months ago from a town about an hour North, and I consider it to be one of the best decisions I have ever made. My number one objective in regards to San Francisco's politics is to allow others to do the same. My understanding is- the only way to have this be feasible for others my age, or below my level of income, or those dealt worse hands than mine, is to Build More Housing.

I realize this can't be solved with one plan and with out the commitment to change on behalf of the people, but my ask to you is, to try pushing change on your side, and we + I will trying pulling on ours.

Thank you kindly and much gratitude,
From- Nadav B. Wichmann 8/24/25

Nadav Wichmann
nadavwichmann@gmail.com
1220 14th Ave.
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** Jorge Correa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, August 25, 2025 6:14:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jorge Correa
mexicopatriot1810@protonmail.com
14526 Hemlock Street
San Leandro, California 94579

**From:** mnchapman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew Chapman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 25, 2025 9:44:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I understand the need for more housing, but this proposal completely ignores the character of the area and will create an ugly, congested cooridor that will become a source of regret in the coming years. I urge you to reconsider, review, and rebalance the proposal to integrate new housing into the area in a way that fits the landscape.

Sincerely,
Matthew Chapman
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** Tim Hua
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
**Date:** Monday, August 25, 2025 10:30:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tim Hua
cool_tim_rx@outlook.com
1920 Yolo Ave
Berkeley, California 94707

**From:** john.kaman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kaman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:16:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement .

Sincerely,
John Kaman
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | jwiggsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Stein |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:04:11 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San Franciscan living on the West Side, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please reconsider this plan!

Sincerely,
Jessica Stein
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** dinaegoldman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dina Goldman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:21:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I do not understand why this plan cannot be implemented in a more thoughtful way. You can meet your goal of increased housing without destroying existing residential neighborhoods. We live in ingleside Terraces, which is a historic neighborhood that was thoughtfully planned. It is very walkable, has lots of natural light, many birds, and lots of beautiful landscaping. We do not want our neighborhood drastically changed. And it is not necessary to implement a plan with such a broad brush-- areas of the city that can support larger buildings exist, and you can implement there, as opposed to everywhere.

Sincerely,
Dina Goldman
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** mikejnohr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Nohr
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 11:20:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The city doesn't even maintain the affordable and subsidized housing we already build. Their are several blocks in the Western Addition that were built around 2000 that are slated to be bulldozed due to mold and poor maintenance. $100s of millions wasted. And, the city population 75 years ago was 775K. Today, it is 810. We have plenty of housing. Help people who need help to stay in their homes instead of funding developers at $1.2MM per unit.

Sincerely,
Michael Nohr
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** lakkisf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fadi Lakkis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 2:17:30 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I support protecting the character of San Francisco, a unique gem in the whole wide world and the reason my wife relocated here a few months despite the high living expense. We love it here and want to spend the rest of our lives here. There's is nothing like SF.  Misguided upzoning stands to benefit developers who are interested in short-term gains by building monstrosities in high real estate neighborhoods and making a quick profit, and not in helping provide affordable housing. There are plenty of empty buildings in the financial district, downtown and south of market. They can be re-purposed and refurbished. Please do not surrender the city to greed, to people who have little interest in the longterm well being of SF and our communities. Haven't we learned from the lessons of the past??

Sincerely,
Fadi Lakkis
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | mckeonsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan McKeon |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:12:05 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan McKeon
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** sfotrace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tracy Fannin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:30:08 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I am born and raised in the Lakeshore District of SF. My family also has very strong Sunset roots. I still live in the house that I grew up in and would like to keep it that way. I love my neighborhood and City very much. I do not want to see it destroyed by these policies that will make it harder for native San Franciscians to continue to live here and what makes each neighborhood unique. I also would like to live out my retirement here. We don't need a bunch of apartment buildings popping up in single family home neighborhoods. It just Isn't appropriate!! There are ways and other areas besides the West Side to add more housing, but this plan is definately not the right way to do it. There needs to be a more thoughtful approach. The City and Mayor also need to be pushing back on the State and telling them NO!!! Please reconsider this plan. Thank You..

Sincerely,
Tracy Fannin
San Francisco, CA 94132

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | robert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Caccia |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:46:13 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a longtime San Franciscan (born, raised, purchased our home on 76 Magnolia Street in 1993), I'm deeply concerned about Mayor Lurie's current plan. While I support smart growth, this proposal encourages the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and risks turning our unique neighborhoods into rows of high-end high-rises that few can afford.

I respectfully urge you to:

- Significantly scale back the proposed upzoning maps
- Request a delay of the January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow for more thoughtful community input

The Mayor's plan would bring sweeping, permanent changes to our city's land use — going far beyond what's necessary, with no guarantees for affordability.

As it stands, this proposal seems to clear the path for widespread demolition and luxury development, putting developer interests above those of everyday San Franciscans. We deserve a city that values inclusive planning over displacement and truly reflects the needs of its communities.

Sincerely,
Robert Caccia
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** patscafesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Darden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, July 24, 2025 2:24:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised

We love San Francisco and feel that these high buildings are a monstrosity.  I feel a 4 or 5 storied building would not distract from the charm of the city.  Please please reconsider your plans.

Sincerely,
Patricia Darden
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Friday, July 25, 2025 1:51:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a renter living in District 3 in San Francisco, I am adamantly against Mayor Lurie's irresponsible upzoning plan, which will encourage demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.
Therefore, I am urging you to: a) Significantly scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps, and b) - Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow time for more reasonable considerations.
Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.
These plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.
This plan is one of the largest threats in the history of San Francisco to make it unaffordable for most of the San Franciscans who live and work here and have made this city the very attractive place it has become live and attract the many tourists that we depend on for our budget

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Friday, July 25, 2025 1:32:11 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** nsaldou37@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natalie Saldou
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:00:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- analyze population growth projections using more recent data as well as looking at housing data (sales, prices, time on market etc) holistically and specifically for SF
- postpone the Mayor's upzoning maps until this analysis is completed and shared publicly with time for commenting, understanding and alignment
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use with zero affordability guarantees. This proposal appears to serve the interests of developers and billionaire investors and not the communities they are supposed to serve.

Sincerely,
Natalie Saldou
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** rrng8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith G
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Saturday, July 26, 2025 8:01:30 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith G
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | mitzi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mitzi Johnson |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:21:54 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mitzi Johnson
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | dennehyc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cathi Dennehy |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Sunday, July 27, 2025 8:56:11 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Cathi Dennehy
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** drgenemccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret McCoy
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Sunday, July 27, 2025 4:08:19 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margaret McCoy
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | jlansing@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Lansing |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 28, 2025 10:59:38 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
James Lansing
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Rhys Sullivan |
| **To:** | Melgar, Myrna (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 28, 2025 1:06:45 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

I'm a resident of District 7. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building  more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure  San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | m.a.tovar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maria Tovar |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 28, 2025 4:58:50 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): in addition to the increase in density, there is no room for improving traffic and other infrastructure. The commute corridor from the freeway to the Marina is tapped out congested. A resounding NO!

Sincerely,
Maria Tovar
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | julie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Giles |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 29, 2025 4:12:19 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and threatens to transform our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury high-rises.

We urge you to:

Significantly scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

These proposed changes would fundamentally alter the character of San Francisco. By promoting widespread demolition, the plan risks driving out the small businesses that give each neighborhood its unique identity and charm. It also threatens to replace historic architecture with generic modern buildings that could exist in any city.

Together, these policies pave the way for mass demolition and luxury development—serving the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the communities they claim to support. This is not thoughtful urban planning; it is displacement disguised as progress, and it will not solve our housing crisis.

Sincerely,
Julie Giles
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** npboley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nathan Boley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 30, 2025 5:03:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hi, I found this email form on Nextdoor asking us to oppose the zoning changes. I completely disagree and oppose this type of low-effort politics.

As a 20 year resident of San Francisco, a home owner, and a parent of 3 young children that I'm raising in a 2 bedroom TIC in North Beach I *strongly* support these changes.

Again, as a San Franciscan, I strongly support Mayor Lurie's plan.

We call on you to:

- Fully support the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Fulfill the January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would help to make the city affordable to working parents and families.

Thanks for your thoughts and consideration.

Sincerely,
Nathan Boley
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** mcdefries@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melissa Seal
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 30, 2025 6:13:59 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): If you've seen this done in other areas, you know will be lost with this upzoning. Please please please scale this back. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Melissa Seal
San Francisco, CA 94108

**From:** lu3mwls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Hayashi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 30, 2025 8:37:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Linda Hayashi
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | rbrandi |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | Lurie, Daniel (MYR) |
| **Subject:** | Mayor Zoning Plan Bad for Small Business |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 31, 2025 10:30:17 AM |
| **Attachments:** | image.png<br>image.png<br>image.png<br>image.png |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members of the Board of Supervisors recently introduced three proposals to “save” small businesses in the face of the Mayor’s upzoning plan that will demolish low rise small businesses. The point of the upzoing is to replace small businesses with high-rise mixed-use commercial and residential projects. However, experience shows that small commercial businesses DO NOT move into the new mixed use high rises projects. Take Upper Market. After more than 10 years none of the businesses are family-owned or open to the general public. There are only banks, gyms or medical clinics leaving 50% vacancies.



2175 Market built 2014. A gym, a walk-in clinic and vacant storefronts.


2200 Market built 2019.  A bank and a vacant storefront.


1998 Market built 2014.  Walk-in clinic, H&R block, and 3 vacant storefronts.

1844 Market built 2014. A bank, a gym, and vacant storefronts.

Developers don't care if the ground floors aren't leased as they can make their profit with the residential units. Everyone knows it so two members of the Board of Supervisor's recently introduced proposals to "save" small businesses. But the measures won't work.

1. Supervisor Melgar would offer grants and small loans to offset the added costs such as moving expenses after buildings have been demolished. This is a severance payment. A business might be able to afford and find a new place to set up shop once but they can't return to the neighborhood. Many will retire, or close. IN ANY CASE, THE NEIGHBORHOOD SERVING BUSINESSES IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD WILL BE GONE FOR GOOD.

2. Supervisor Chan would continue oversight for official "legacy businesses" — those that have operated for 30 years or more. They only protection from demolition is approval from the Planning Commission. And there are only 427 legacy businesses out of 94,000 small businesses.

3. Chan's other measure would help employees to band together to purchase the business they work

for when the owner is looking to sell. This is a non sequitur, if the building is torn down, who cares who the new owner is?

The Mayor's upzoning plan is analogous to the displacement caused by urban renewal in the

1960s. Then the government bought property under eminent domain and resold it to developers. The property owners got pennies on the dollar and the tenants got nothing. Many neighborhoods were demolished and remained deserts for decades.

This time the government is upzoning the land, enriching the property owners while giving the tenants, i.e. small businesses, nothing. Under both urban renewal and the Mayor's plan the upheaval to people's lives, the destruction of businesses, and the hollowing out of neighborhoods is justified by the greater good. Urban renewal was justified as a *housing program*. Today, we have a small business demolition plan couched as a housing program, "Family Zoning Plan." The hope is that high-rise projects will produce a lot of housing. Experience shows the apartments or condos that are actually built are too small and too expensive for middle income families. The number of "affordable" units are too few to make a dent for low-income families. And there is nothing to prevent the loss of small businesses.

Before urban renewal was finally shut down, the government made relocation payments which were inadequate, just like the Board of Supervisors is proposing today. Please don't make the same mistake and destroy the neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Richard Brandi

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | greta.alexander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greta Alexander |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 31, 2025 2:59:48 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greta Alexander
San Francisco, CA 94111

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 31, 2025 3:03:55 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jim Flanagan |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Saturday, August 2, 2025 11:54:21 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bianca Dibartolo-Forrester |
| **To:** | Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Cc:** | ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org |
| **Subject:** | I support more housing (via GrowSF.org) |
| **Date:** | Sunday, August 3, 2025 10:58:07 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.
Bianca Forrester

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please alert the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message

**From:** zrants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mari Eliza
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 4, 2025 8:04:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Mari Eliza
San Francisco, CA 94110

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | knit1purl1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of PATIENCE HUTCHINSON |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Monday, August 4, 2025 8:15:18 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Monday, August 4, 2025 9:17:09 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as “progress.” In fact, allowing this will decimate low income housing since no percentage of units in the new buildings allocated for this.Why isn’t that the case? Also, the heights allowed in this proposed plan will also take away all sight corridors and view vistas—the reason San Francisco is the world’s number one tourist destination. Without our beautiful Victorians and Edwardians, we are as faceless as Houston and Atlanta. And taller buildings on our narrow streets will mean blocked streets even worse than they are now by delivery trucks.

Please vote to keep the narrower streets at their current zoned heights.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:05:08 AM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I was born here and have lived here 60 years and it's so disappointing to see this happening to my city. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

Please please stop this craziness!!

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** sarahssung@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Sung
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:07:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sarah Sung
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:08:26 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ENOUGH! STOP PLEASE!

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
San Francisco, CA 94118

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | morganspierce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgan Pierce |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:08:52 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco Business Owner, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morgan Pierce
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:11:20 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Senta Tsantilis

**From:** dede.estey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dede Estey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:11:28 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional  particular concern along Fulton facing Golden Gate Park as many beautiful old homes  from Edwardian times and single family residents would be  demolished leaving ugly cookie cutter boxes in their place along with local residents with high costs to rent or afford to buy. In the Richmond District. ):

Sincerely,
Dede Estey
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | rbrandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Brandi |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:12:27 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): we all know this plan will destroy small neighborhood businesses witness the small business commission action and 2 board of supervisors proposals but nothing is in the plan to save our neighborhoods. This is most reckless land use dictat of the state and we must fight it in the courts if necessary. Call weiners buff.

Sincerely,
Richard Brandi

**From:** damianinglin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Damian Inglin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:32:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I STRONGLY oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): There is no need for additional housing in San Francisco. This push for housing is gaslighting. Stop the destruction of San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Damian Inglin
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** okeeffengc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norma OKeeffe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:36:50 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Norma OKeeffe
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** films@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Irving
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:42:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To Mayor Lurie: Going forward, do you want to be the mayor who is blamed for demolishing the city that residents and tourists love? Or would you prefer to be remembered as the mayor who pushed back against the State's takeover of our planning and zoning process? As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose your plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on our elected and appointed representatives to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Demand a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

The upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Don't buy into it. You will be sorry if you do.

Sincerely,
Judy Irving
San Francisco, CA 94133

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:46:54 AM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** epoole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Edward Poole
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:49:34 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

AS a resicent of Cow Hollow, I could not be more upset at this prospect.  Way to ruin the neighborhood feel of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Edward Poole
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** cadamb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brendan Cadam
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:49:45 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and bayview resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing, and transformation of our neighborhoods into mismatched high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use and skyline — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Brendan Cadam
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:50:13 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

**From:** madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:52:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is designed to create chaos for residents of this once beautiful city.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:57:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, downgrades architectual preservation, and can transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Use the power of your office to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Alice Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of DIANA GIAMPAOLI
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:02:43 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Danie Lurie is backed by construction companies/workers.  This is not bringing affordable housing.  It is making the construction industry richer and ruining our city.  THERE IS PLENTY OF HOUSING SITTING VACANT.  STOP GETTING DEVELOPERS RICHER.

Sincerely,
DIANA GIAMPAOLI
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** danolley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Nolley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:20:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long-time San Franciscan (BA SFSU '68), I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. My wife and I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps; and
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition as well as luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
David Nolley
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** audreyrbjorklund@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Bjorklund
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:28:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

These plans will ruin the flavor and personality of San Francisco and what makes it a special and wonderful city to live in. DO not destroy the beauty of our city for the sake profit and those who don't care about its future or the people and neighborhoods that make it all it is.

Sincerely,
Audrey Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | beckyfchristian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Becky Christian |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:29:18 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Becky Christian
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jun Ishimuro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:31:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jun Ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:36:44 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I do not want the Westside of SF overbuilt.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:38:27 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | aschuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Angelique Schuppek |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:42:36 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The reason people come to visit and live in SF is because of the beautiful and historic neighborhoods like North Beach. Please reject the upzoning of North Beach!

Sincerely,
Angelique Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:46:39 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ):I think the first priority in new housing is dealing with empty office buildings in downtown. New homes in this area will bring more activity and improve business. The height on Lombard, Geary of 11 stories is crazy. I think empty buildings and lots should be built up but max height 5-6 floors. I’ve owned my property for years but this could adversely impact neighbors who have recently purchased their properties.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong |
| **To:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701] |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:47:42 PM |

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

**From:** andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:53:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I am a longtime resident of the Richmond District and am profoundly disgusted and disillusioned by the idea that a few out of touch politicians with no familiarity with, let alone appreciation for, my neighborhood are about to circumvent the democratic process, exclude community input, and sell out my neighborhood to real estate developers and billionaire tech interests who fund Sen. Weiner and apparently Mayor Lurie as well. There has been a lot of concern in recent years about threats to democracy. I share that concern. One of the biggest threats to democracy I see comes in the form of greedy land speculators hiding behind the language of "Abundance." Mayor Lurie's proposed blanket upzoning plan will result in major and irreversible changes to the character of our city. We must not rush to approve something with such major impact. Please take the time to consider the second order effects (e.g. displacement of businesses and long-term renters, greater traffic congestion, decreased quality of life for existing residents, loss of the unique character of our city.) What is the rush? Who benefits?

I am also the parent of young college graduates, native San Franciscans who are moving back to the city to start their careers and currently in the process of navigating the rental market. I am not removed from their challenges; and even so I question the need for massive upzoning. The young San Franciscans I know - as opposed to the Astro-turf YIMBY activists who are few but make a lot of noise - want nothing to do with the homogenized, soul-less, cheaply constructed schlock that this blanket, indiscriminate upzoning proposal will yield - with no accountability for developers and no guarantee of actual affordability.

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 14 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_727 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 24, 2025 12:16:20 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 14 Letters Regarding File No. 250700_701_727.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 14 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250727: Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 79 (Wiener) Unless Amended - Housing Development: Transit- Oriented Development

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** cristal_parsons@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cristal Parsons
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, July 24, 2025 10:11:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Cristal Parsons
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 12:10:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** lynnemerryburwell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynne Burwell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 1:12:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Like most San Franciscans, I hear sad stories of people being evicted from affordable rentals and forced to leave the city. The mayor's plan does nothing to address the displacement problem. Instead, it will encourage expensive housing in ever-taller buildings, with a very small amount going toward affordable housing.

The strength of San Francisco is in its neighborhoods and the community that neighborhoods foster. Plunking down high-rise buildings in low-rise neighborhoods will destroy the fabric of our city.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Lynne Burwell
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** nadyanomad@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nadya Williams
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 4:17:03 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The great majority of San Franciscans do not want the beauty, human scale, unique architecture and community character of The City destroyed for real estate wealth. We are not fooled.
It is a place for the billionaire/trillionaire class to park their money! They don't care if the Luxury condos and office spaces are largely vacant. We know the falsehoods of the promise of "affordable" housing.

We know the funding behind Mahmood, Sauter and Weiner!

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nadya Williams
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** blindauer46@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bonnie Lindauer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 4:21:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. This is not the San Francisco I have lived in and loved for over 30 years. Luxury or even middle-class housing is not needed. What is needed is true affordable housing for the working class.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

I don't want to join a friend who is leaving San Francisco for the reason that it's too expensive, so PLEASE do NOT support Lurie's and Weiner's actions.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bonnie Lindauer
San Francisco, CA 94134

**From:** rhiannonwelch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhiannon Welch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 9:54:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rhiannon Welch
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** Kburgigrass@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Grass
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 11:43:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):We have lived in Cow Hollow for over 40 years(husband natvie SFranciscan!), proud and involved neighborhood home owners who are now helping raise next generation of family...our neighborhood is already congested and crowded to maximum; please DO NOT add anymore housing to this part of the City when there are open/and or less crowded areas to consider...we would like to retire and continue to be involved here in our neighborhood, and see our grown children and grandchildren thrive here, vs. considering moving out of our beloved City...thank you for considering, please visit our neighborhood at any time and see what I am concerned about...Karen Grass, RN

Sincerely,
Karen Grass
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** baughmancardenas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Deborah Cardenas
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 11:59:45 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a world traveling San Franciscan born in the Presidio, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors all based on a housing study that is still challenged for accuracy.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- Find alternative ways to house the unhoused with the many empty housing units we currently have.

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. I have been to many countries that were made true concrete jungles due to bad and short sighted planning.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Let's see some transparency here. Where is the money that is driving this and who stands to make it? There is a lot of distrust in our city government right now due to the budget overruns, fraud, missing funds, etc. Turn it around by really proving that changing the nature of our city is required and no other alternative will solve the problem.

Sincerely,
Deborah Cardenas
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** sandra.derian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandra Derian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 12:21:24 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

This plan will lead to evicting people who have lived in the community for 30+ years. You want to evict people who have contributed by caring for others in the community in various ways that benefit fellow neighbors and small businesses. Where will the people in the buildings being upzoned go when there is ZERO affordable housing that matches their current monthly rent expense? You're not evicting the wealthy. You're evicting low income and middle income, hard-working long-term residents without any solution to give them equal housing during the construction period. We are people who have made a life in the community by being employed within the city limits, by paying for SFMTA services, and furthermore, displacing us will be a detriment to each person's life, negatively impacting their relations who live within close proximity; upsetting the lives of hundreds of thousands of people who don't have first month, last month, and a security deposit in their savings to find a new place to live during construction. We don't have the funds to pay movers. We don't know a person with a truck who wants to help us move our entire apartment to a new place. Upzoning will lead to further gentrification of neighborhoods. Whole areas of the city will lose their unique character. Manhattanizing SF will only further encourage speculative real estate practices for the millionaires and foreign investores. Please do not upzone and displace the hundreds of thousands of people who have made San Francisco unique to other Bay Area cities.

Sincerely,
Sandra Derian
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** lizschenk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liz Schenk
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 4:27:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Liz Schenk
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** catherinebehrens@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Behrens
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 4:57:25 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support affordable housing accommodations, particularly for essential workers in SF so they can live where they work. However, I oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which appears to be extreme and overshoots the mark. The heights of the buildings proposed will likely result in transforming our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors rather than providing affordable housing. In addition, the upzoning is excessive and incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses. Russian Hill/North Beach is a beautiful and historic neighborhood that is not only home to many San Franciscans who live and work here, but also attracts significant numbers of tourists who wish to enjoy the beauty and hospitality that the neighborhood offers.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please look at the bigger picture and reconsider these plans. As we are rapidly learning, in addition to the immediate impact of policy changes, there are also long-lasting and often irreversible consequences that result from myopic and hasty decisions.

Thank you for your attention to this issue and for your continued service to San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Catherine Behrens
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** soundsationally@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Ziffer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 5:36:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

BUILDING UP IS NOT THE ANSWER!!!!!!! As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): This is OUR city, not the mayors office or the developers. People's voices should be heard on any single environmental and structural change that affects our lives, for months ( construction, delays, traffic, noise, pollution, destruction)  and for years.. ( views, sunlight, congestion, parking)

Sincerely,
Brian Ziffer
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** cadamb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brendan Cadsm
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:01:01 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Brendan Cadsm
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** gregg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gregg Butensky
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
**Date:** Thursday, July 24, 2025 11:07:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed upzoning plan.

As a San Franciscan, I'm very concerned that this plan will drive up rents, displace long-term tenants, push out small businesses, and cause irreparable harm to our neighborhoods.

While change is inevitable in a city such as ours, it's critical that we collectively work for the common good. The current upzoning plan will require the demolition of many buildings, resulting in the displacement of lower income residents and small businesses.

Especially given the current national climate, it is paramount that San Francisco retains its values and cares for all of its residents.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Gregg Butensky

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 48 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_727 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 22, 2025 12:23:27 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 48 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_701_727.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 48 letters regarding File Nos.:

250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan
250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan
250727: Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 79 (Wiener) Unless Amended - Housing Development: Transit- Oriented Development

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** Josinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josephine Lucchesi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 4:12:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Josephine Lucchesi
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** marygassert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Gassert
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 5:18:12 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
These proposals go too far. They will destroy the neighborhoods that make San Francisco desirable to families. There is absolutely no guarantee that any of the new housing will benefit those who need it. There is no guarantee that the new housing will incorporate outdoor space for a more livable environment. There is no preservation of the architecture for which San Francisco is famous. The only developments that will likely be built are luxury towers along the water. San Franciscans are not naive, we know this is the result of development money that has been pouring into the politicians coffers. Stand up to the corrupting influence of big money.

Sincerely,
Mary Gassert
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** pjduff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia J Duff
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 5:29:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I object to the destruction of historic buildings in upzoned areas that have never been formally evaluated for listing on a historic register as required by CEQA and will not be given further consideration once the upzoning imitative has been approved.

I object to the characterization by housing proponents of historic building owners. Most of us did not inherit our property but saved for years for a down payment on homes with long-deferred maintenance. It was our sweat equity that provided the homes that are so precious to us today. We do not oppose new housing. We just want to have a say in new construction that affects or destroys our historic homes and neighborhoods.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as affordability. This is a nationwide effort by corporate real estate interests! It is happening in Seattle, WA, Denver, CO and San Diego. To name a few. The massive real estate speculation this plan is likely to ignite will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis.

Sincerely,
Patricia J Duff
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** bellacatus@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Bellin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 6:22:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Catherine Bellin
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** hobb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sherri Samu
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 6:33:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sherri Samu
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** barbarabdelaney@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Delaney
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:09:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Please reject this bill. It is not a good fit for development in San Francisco and threatens to erase all that is unique about the city.

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Delaney
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** barakosmd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jerome Barakos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:57:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Let's build the projects that are already approved rather than starting with new zoning first.

Sincerely,
Jerome Barakos
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** abxguba@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Barakos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:58:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Let's build the projects that are already approved rather than starting with new zoning first.

Sincerely,
Andrew Barakos
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** angryoctopus@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stuart Barakos
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:58:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Let's build the projects that are already approved rather than starting with new zoning first.

Sincerely,
Stuart Barakos
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** mark.r.berwick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Berwick
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 8:04:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mark Berwick
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** zike13.5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of michael zabelle
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 8:19:03 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The forcing of high rise apt / condo buildings is extremely bad for SF and it's citizens. If SF was just another city like LA or Sacramento then I would have a different opinion but SF is a jewel of the world. SF is arguably the most beautiful city in the world yet Scot Weiner treats it like the above mentioned cities. Please protect the beauty of each SF neighborhood and stop Scot Weiner's urban renewal plan. Please.

Sincerely,
michael zabelle
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** artiekramer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arthur Kramer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:20:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Arthur Kramer
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** mtcarhart@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew Carhart
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 11:02:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Matthew Carhart
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** racwar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rachel Ward
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 7:57:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is the 3rd letter I have written on this subject given I feel SO strongly about it.

I voted for Daniel Lurie - but if this plan goes through - I shall never again.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps especially along Lombard Street.
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

I can only see the benefits for developers - not for those who actually currently live in the Cow Hollow & Marina communities.

Sincerely,
Rachel Ward
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** travlsprt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Annemarie Rossi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 8:07:54 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps or better yet eliminate the possibility of his bill passing.
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning. Planning requires consideration of resources available and repurposing empty or mostly vacant buildings.

I live at 1835 Golden Gate Ave. There is a monstrosity of a building behind my residence that has no business being there at over 9 stories high. It's out of character, out of place for the neighborhood and I can't sit silent and let this happen elsewhere in our city.

Please, I urge you to find another way.

Sincerely,
Annemarie Rossi
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** romalynschmaltz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Romalyn Schmaltz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 8:15:05 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Esp. Attention to my new supervisor Danny Sauter:

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Romalyn Schmaltz
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** priscillamuniz1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Priscilla Muniz
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:45:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Priscilla Muniz
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** julssf35@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Juli Sante
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:49:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Juli Sante
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** ntdc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neil Dellacava
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:53:41 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I think you've miss the economics. It's very expensive to build in San Francisco. How can our fireman teachers and even policeman afford the rentals in the city of San Francisco. The numbers just don't make sense. I'd love to see the affordability index that you folks create. I just read about a recent plan where developers paid the right price and were able to increase the number of units and decrease the number of local housing. You guys are kidding Going forward I don't believe I can support any politician who supports this initiative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Neil Dellacava
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** r_bloch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rene Bloch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:58:24 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rene Bloch
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** denisemgeorge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denise George
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 10:22:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Denise George
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** buckbagot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Buck Bagot
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 10:29:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The upzoning plan is an exercise in Reagonomic tricolor down theory. Build 100% affordable housing. No marketbrate housing.

Sincerely,
Buck Bagot
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** carole.stahlkopf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole Stahlkopf
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 11:19:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Lisa Chen and Myrna Melgar,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

As a 50+ year resident of this city, what I have loved the most about this city is its immense diversity in culture, life stye, and neighborhoods. Should you prefer living in a lively neighborhood, there is SOMA; should you prefer an area with small shops and many restaurants, there is the Sacramento Street area; should you prefer living in a quiet neighborhood, there is my neighborhood, Ingleside Terraces. Choices like these make San Francisco the fascinating and unique city that it is. The homogenization of housing as proposed will diminish the value and appeal of the choices available to residents.

Given the number of housing permits already approved, I ask that there be a thoughtful delay in making a decision on housing that will have such potentially drastic effects on the residents of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Carole Stahlkopf
149 Moncada Way
San Francisco CA 94127

Sincerely,
Carole Stahlkopf
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** madyjones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mady Jones
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 11:46:00 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I have lived in SF for 55 years. I remember well the devastating effects of the Fillmore Urban Renewal. Please don't make similar mistakes now. We need more housing but we need to respect historical neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Mady Jones
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** richard-marini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Marini
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:27:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a  native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Senator Weiner and Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): There is no guarantee nor plan that ensures that the changes will provide "affordable" housing.  It will forever change the city that we know and love into a fragmented cluster of buildings serving the rich.
The city cannot even keep up with its current issues like street and sidewalk repair, infrastructure maintenance including sewers and trees.  Please tell me how it will keep up with this growth plan?
Upzoning etc. is not why I voted for the current leadership and will certainly be the reason they will be VOTED OUT when the time comes.  Hopefully the damage will not be irreversible by then.

Sincerely,
Richard Marini
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** maryksullivan4@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Sullivan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:29:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary Sullivan
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** seaward94122@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of STEVE WARD
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:50:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

In the most dense city west of the Hudson River we must develop with discretion to preserve SF's world renowned character and the quality of life FOR OUR CURRENT RESIDENTS! Reduce the office vacancy to 10% before approving any up zoning in neighborhoods
not desiring it through repurposing to mixed use. This is the economic and environmental best strategy.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
STEVE WARD
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** upzoneoverreachemail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vance Nesbitt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 2:31:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

Sincerely,
Vance Nesbitt
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** padysplace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luis Pine
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 5:44:38 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
How can we correct a situation whereby an Industry (Building) whose priority is profiting, gets to influence public offices about the need and parameters for building? Or, to put it another way, how do we correct our public officials (from city supervisors, state assembly and governor), who are protecting and prioritizing the will of an industry instead of the need of the citizens of a city whom they're required to represent?

Sincerely,
Luis Pine
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** ayun112@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andersen Yun
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 7:29:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Buliding new buildings has never in the history of San Francisco resulted in the needed amount of affordable housing. We need to rethink the idea that new buildings = affordable housing if we turn over land to rich, corporate developers, who only have profits in mind. As an example, the newish building on sloat near 47 th ave is alreadyt being repaired, and the building on Ocean and Miramar has new scaffolding around it for needed repairs. Neither of these buildings offer affordable housing, yet the build quality is shoddy. Add to that the relaxation of building codes in the name of the economy and turning back CEQA regulations, and the residents of San Francisco can expect high rents, shoddy buildings and the continued growth of RV's on the street and tent cities, as well as a degraded enviornment. Please oppose SB79 and the upzoning deadline!!

Sincerely,
Andersen Yun
San Francisco, CA 94112

**From:** alan94117@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alan Collins
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Thursday, July 17, 2025 11:37:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alan Collins
San Francisco, CA 94107

**From:** quinnevent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phyllis Quinn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Friday, July 18, 2025 1:13:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
Stop trying to make San Francisco the land of expensive Towers!  Do not destroy our neighborhoods!  Go somewhere else!

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (see above):

Sincerely,
Phyllis Quinn
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** bailey.kathyr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Bailey
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Friday, July 18, 2025 3:41:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Have increased traffic and parking [and other infrastructure] issues been seriously considered?

Sincerely,
Kathy Bailey
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** smoughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Moughan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Friday, July 18, 2025 8:24:30 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which destroys the character of our most beautiful and historic neighborhoods by replacing lovely buildings with 6 story towers.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sarah Moughan
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Friday, July 18, 2025 9:32:09 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Giampaoli
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Saturday, July 19, 2025 8:28:48 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please we ask for you to keep the building to a 3 to 4 story minimium. This won't be affordable housing. People won't take the transportation along Lombard. Right now it's for Google, Facebook, etc at Silicon Valley. SF has enough buildings for housing. STOP THE UPZONING. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** angieschuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Angelique Schuppek
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Saturday, July 19, 2025 9:31:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I live in North Beach. I love our neighborhood full of character and beautiful views! This is why I moved here. I don't want to change it into a neighborhood full of modern buildings. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Angelique Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** schuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Schuppek
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Saturday, July 19, 2025 3:38:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I strongly oppose the upzoning in North Beach, where we live, as that will take away from charm and community feel which we love about our neighborhood and of the City. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Richard Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** krf.1sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Franklin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Saturday, July 19, 2025 6:07:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Franklin
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** pennyfino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Penelope Finocchiaro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Sunday, July 20, 2025 5:24:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as mandate.

Never disregard our elegant city and how careful planning
has added growth with reason. I don't understand the urgency for demolition and building where it is not necessary. It's about money. What about huge deserted areas that could be repurposed- like the block of the old flower mart.

I'm a longtime owner in North Beach/telegraph hill. Yes to improving long deserted properties but NOT destroying everyone's waterfront views for the few privileged. Disgusting.

Sincerely,
Penelope Finocchiaro
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Sunday, July 20, 2025 6:31:16 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is insane! We have lived in Cow Hollow for nearly 50 years and have never seen such an assault on the neighborhood that we love.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
jim connelly
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** aj.t.swoboda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of AJ Swoboda
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Monday, July 21, 2025 6:47:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My wife and I are raising our family in Jordan Park, a neighborhood that is ALREADY adding 1300+ housing units without all of these insane plans the Mayor is proposing. We want development and we believe in SF, but we also can't adopt a tech policy of "move fast; break things" when it comes to something so permanent and long lasting. I have spoke at two hearings in City Hall about how thoughtless the Mayor's initial (and still current version) of zoning is. He and his administration are clearly looking to ram plans through by relying on citizens to either be unaware or to eventually give up fighting.

Sincerely,
AJ Swoboda
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** isadore.rosenthal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Isadore Rosenthal
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Monday, July 21, 2025 12:26:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Isadore Rosenthal
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** ericajoykatrak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Katrak
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Monday, July 21, 2025 1:45:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and someone who would like to stay here and enjoy this beautiful and creative city throughout the rest of my life, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers and enriches developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's not only outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality, but poorly thought through from the beginning and not in the interest of the average citizen. That mandate should be CHALLENGED — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You cannot rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. Once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous. You can only ruin a city once.

I, like a huge number of people who live here, urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve irreplaceable and unique historic character
– Preserve the vistas that draw visitors from around the world
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Erica Katrak
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** esthermk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Esther Marks
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Monday, July 21, 2025 7:11:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Esther Marks
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** ALSundby@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Sundby
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 9:27:26 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Ann Sundby
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** vernshah@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Verna Shaheen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 11:13:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have been active in preservation efforts in SF for at least 25 years. I am a member of SF Heritage and SF Victorian Alliance in addition to SF History Association. We must preserve our architectural gems, neighborhood character, and proper scale. Let's find more creative solutions as well as inventory all of the vacant hotels and other buildings before unnecessarily building more!!!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Verna Shaheen
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** taylor.lint@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Taylor Lint
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 22, 2025 10:46:09 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

– Protect renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Taylor Lint
San Francisco, CA 94109

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250727 - 78 letters |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:45:52 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 78 letters.pdf |

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 78 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C

(Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250727 - Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill 79 (Wiener) and similar future legislation, unless amended to give Local governments adequate ability to formulate local plans through its local legislative process, in which local governments and residents have adequate review and oversight of community planning, including affordability requirements, and residential and commercial tenant protections.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office*

*does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** mhesse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marianne Hesse
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:22:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marianne Hesse
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:22:11 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

While I encourage more housing it should be done in a manner that preserves the look and feel of the neighborhoods.There are empty buildings all around the city that could be targeted for larger footprints - the closed movie theatre at 18th ave and Garry, the old closed restaurant next to Trader Joe's on Masonic, the closed north point movie theatre on north point - and many more. What happened to the office conversion idea to bring traffic into downtown San Francisco ? We have a 30+ % office vacancy rate.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** barbara@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Mann
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:26:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Mann
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** johnzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Zlatunich
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:27:41 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Zlatunich
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** cydney1010@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cydney DeBenedetto
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:37:06 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Cydney DeBenedetto

**From:** carolynkenady@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Kenady
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:46:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carolyn Kenady
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** marycmcf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary McFadden
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:46:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a forth generation San Franciscan. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Not only is this an environmental disaster, it destroys our shared history by eviscerating our communities. It is a gift to those who care nothing for the City or its residents, who see the people who built this place, who call this place home as obstacles to their increasing wealth.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** nerok09@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eugen Koren
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:47:00 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eugen Koren
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** apeichhorn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Eichhorn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:49:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

And this will adversely impact our personal/home experiences and property values. This will likely result in long protracted, and expensive battles. Let's work to create a mindful approach. And not make our neighborhoods into Manhattan.

Sincerely,
Andrea Eichhorn
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** familyadler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian A
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:56:46 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 50 year resident of the Sunset District of San Francisco. Upzoning is inconsistent with our (and many) neighborhoods, and against the will of the people who have paid a fortune to live in a peaceful, well managed, family friendly neighborhood. Further, these upzoning proposals are DISCRIMINATORY - they apply to our middle class neighborhood, but NOT affluent St. Francis Woods, or Pacific Heights.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Brian A
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** margaretmm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret McFarland
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:00:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Margaret McFarland
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** tolinhanley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SALLY HANLEY
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:09:29 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
SALLY HANLEY
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** savethegreathighway@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:23:21 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is grossly negligent.

Residents deserve better.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:34:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

**From:** daviddeiwert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Deiwert
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:41:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS : The Western Addition, Japan Town, does not need this to happen again.

Sincerely,
David Deiwert
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** tamrob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tamra Marshall
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:53:08 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 30 year resident of San Francisco and have raised a family here and I strive to see our city continue to be a place where families and individuals can live, grow and thrive. I agree that we need to develop a plan for more AFFORDABLE housing in our city and state, yet I find the current plans for SF to be purposefully confusing, misleading and full of potential for corruption and not focused on the "family" part of FAMILY ZONING (as the new name would lead one to believe).

Mayor Lurie's Family Zoning Plan has very little to do with building affordable housing and enriching communities for middle class and lower-middle class residents, but much to do with enriching developers to build fast, cheap high-rise structures that will diminish neighborhood cohesiveness and the unique architecture that represents the character of our city.

I want an upzoning plan, but this one misses the mark! San Francisco's young people and families do not want to live in high rises - they want affordable and charming apartments, condos, flats and homes that have a neighborhood feel - not tall boxes with windows that offer little in the way of long term appeal and a sense of home.

Increasing the heights only along the Muni corridors will a create stark and unbalanced feel and it creates an unnecessary burden on just some neighborhoods when we have great public transportation everywhere in this city. I propose we explore raising the height limits more consistently across the entire city to keep a balanced urban landscape and include regulations that require new and higher buildings to have architectural features that blend and enhance existing neighborhood structures and retain the SF charm. Let's face it, developers will not do that unless it is required.

This plans needs much more creative thought into how to increase AFFORDABLE housing and keep our City as a visually beautiful place to live and receive visitors from all over the world.

I've raised 2 sons in the City and both of them loved growing up here and have strong ties and friends from every neighborhood around town. I grew up in the suburbs in the midwest and never had the same feeling of neighborhood belonging that I get here. Both of my adult sons are now SFUSD teachers - one a kindergarten teacher and one a high school teacher. They want to remain living here and raise their own families in this beloved city. But, I worry about the affordability problem and that is what should be the focus in a new plan. I am not against change and increasing height limits all across the city but I see NO real increase in affordability in this plan nor a way to attract and retain middle class families. I recommend a new look at this plan that really addresses the problems! Let's not take the quick-fix route based on arbitrary numbers sent down from Sacramento and the politicians who want to climb the ladder. We can surely do better!

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79

- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Tamra Marshall
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** mhuettl62@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martha Huettl
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:53:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Martha Huettl
San Francisco, CA 94110

**From:** tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:59:48 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** emmo55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Emmons
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:09:10 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Don Emmons
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** sfromana@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anne-Marie Russo
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:12:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I've lived in San Francisco Tenderloin District for over 20 years. I believe in preserving the fabric of our city, keeping small businesses alive and not disrupting communities. Not to mention the unique charm of our neighborhoods that make living here a joy. The upzoning maps are not conducive to the type of city we all choose to live in. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Keep San Francisco Neighborhoods as micro-communities, not mass luxury corridors.

Sincerely,
Anne-Marie Russo
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** juliepaul164@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Paul
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:15:52 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

CITY OFFICIALS: Please take note--the reason I am so against these plans and proposed legislation is that they will NOT fix the problem and will DESTROY our neighborhoods in the process. Citizens are waking up and outraged that Mayor Lurie's "Family" Plan is based on faulty numbers and the scale is completely outsized. San Francisco's population is static (after significantly declining), baby boomers will be aging out of their homes and birth rates are on the decline. We do not need this much capacity, and the result will be hodge-podgey towers built randomly to the financial benefit of developers at the expense of residents. San Francisco Planning officials should not be flippantly saying, "Well, we won't have to rezone for the next 50 years." This defies the purpose of an 8-year Housing Element cycle and violates the principles of good city planning which should be interative based on actual needs. Furthermore, the elementary belief that more supply = lower prices is bogus because housing is a vastly different industry than manufacturing. Builders do not have to build housing to try to cover their fixed costs--they will only build if it is profitable which is exactly what they should do. The real solutions are more subsidized housing, more rapid transit and higher minimum wages.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Julie Paul
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Bucchioni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:21:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and concerned D7 resident I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Iris Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** tb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Bucchioni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:30:12 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Thomas Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Smalley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:32:09 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jane Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** lmuhlfeld@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of louise patterson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:48:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
louise patterson
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** billykgp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Kucera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:52:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
William Kucera
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:53:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

WTF!!!! Does this mean that hundreds of people will be displaced because of back-door eminent domain???? NOT ON OUR HOUSE!

Weiner and his fascist, non-inclusive, multi-billion dollar real estate and tech industry backers (the same people who support Trump) are preparing for the big steal with SB79! Stop him and stop this NOW! San Francisco went through redevelopment once. My family was here during those years. People's homes were stolen in the name of progress and a very few people made lots of money.. Weiner=Trump. He should be voted out of office and more sensible approaches to housing need to prevail.

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino

**From:** randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:11:46 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please remember what urban renewal did to the Fillmore.

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei

**From:** davidheran@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Heran
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:23:54 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SF natives, such as myself, are disgusted with those who masquerade as stewards of the public interest. It is hard to debunk the "misinformation" of 15 Minute Cities, when our politicians are raining down multiple high-rise buildings

on us to become our new "homes", when our traditional homes are bulldozed. There is no population explosion in San Francisco, or much of the Bay Area, which would justify this maniacal level of building. Stop it now! I demand a moratorium on ALL residential building,

and will never vote for those who uphold this building madness which is designed to subjugate humanity. Keep the status quo that existed
before Sacramento introduced building mandates, whereby individual communities, NOT Sacramento, determine building policies! Let

G. Newsom know that he is a failure to his masters at the World Economic Forum. Everyone knows.

Sincerely,
David Heran
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** pepperadamsjh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Harrison
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:30:17 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Janet Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** dpj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Devon Johnson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:32:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Devon Johnson
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** ljasminek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L J Kim
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:33:36 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
L J Kim
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** vijamh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vija Hovgard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:43:49 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Vija Hovgard
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** jpjh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Hopkins
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 2:56:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco is one of Americas most unique and historic cities where preservation should be paramount. We are Americas best version of a historical European city. Replacing historic architectural buildings with glass boxes (already turning Market St into a monochromatic desert) is shortsighted. Yes, we need housing but do not go about it in a DOGE Trumpian chainsaw, building at all costs, manner which Sen Wiener has been implementing. We have already eliminated major views of the hills and bay which made us so attractive. Eliminating our historic housing stock is a travesty for future generations.
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Hopkins
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:12:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:25:26 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am long time resident of San Francisco. I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, the displacement of renters and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We need to be thoughtful about housing and focus on affordable units. This upzoning plan does not provide affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Garrity
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:45:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** ngilson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of nina gilson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:49:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
nina gilson
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** carlas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carla Schlemminger
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 4:00:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carla Schlemminger
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** rkram1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rona Kram
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 4:28:45 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rona Kram
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** pjcoats@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Coats
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:11:57 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Coats
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:13:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Destroying the individual flavor of our neighborhoods and hurting small businesses is not acceptable.

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** rbrandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of richard brandi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:23:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
richard brandi

**From:** m.diane.weber@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Weber
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:03:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As an Outer Richmond resident, I'm deeply concerned about the proposed blanket upzoning threatening the historic Lincoln Manor neighborhood, and request an exemption of Clement Street (west of 33rd Ave) and Geary Boulevard (36th–38th Ave) due to its historic and coastal nature.Our neighborhood provides GGNRA green space enjoyed by many throughout the city, where scenes of natural beauty and birdlife are abundant, with countless people cycling by daily, riding by in the tourist GoCars, or golfing at Lincoln Park. Upzoning would destroy the unique, historic character of Lincoln Manor and Shore View—areas that deserve the same protection as Sea Cliff and The Great Highway. Additionally, there are no buses or businesses west of 33rd on Clement, so it is neither a transit corridor nor a commercial area. Blanket upzoning here will not create affordable family housing; it will just mean more expensive, smaller units and fewer homes for families and seniors. The Richmond District suffered through an era of "Richmond Specials" not that long ago. Once existing houses are demolished and ones out of character with the district are built, it will be too late to save the character of this neighborhood. The character of different neighborhoods is an integral part of what makes San Francisco a city beloved worldwide. Instead of incentivizing developers, speculation and high-end condos, let's use existing vacant units and identify sites where larger units will fit into existing commercial and built-up areas.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Diane Weber
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** hhuebel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of holly huebel
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:16:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
holly huebel
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:26:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Outrageous shredding of the Fabric of San Francisco!
As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** twistee2u@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fiona Friedland
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:27:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: As a 40 year resident of San Francisco, I have seen the haphazard development of luxury housing around SF. Adding more housing for rich people is not what we need. The city has already lost so many of our creatives and artists to techie hipster douchebags. We need more affordable housing to keep our city diverse and interesting. What used to be a rainbow is now an egg - white and yellow. Bring back affordable housing along with more parks, green space, schools and services that families need.

Sincerely,
Fiona Friedland
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** corex123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Kaytun
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:36:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Diana Kaytun

**From:** krf.1sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Franklin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 6:36:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Karen Franklin
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** gingerpepper@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ginger Pepper
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:08:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Americans haven't learned yet that tearing down buildings & homes only to replace the country's best carpentry with dubious building construction that won't last or compliment San Francisco's unique Spanish, French, Italian & Victorian homes. It will be
destroying the history of San Francisco's artisans, architecture, Victorians and our neighborhoods unique different styles. This is why tourists come here and say "one of the most beautiful cities in the world". Real estate is out of control and it's up to you the representatives to protect San Franciscan's property rights without creating insecurity for the residents. We don't need more people crammed into a 48 square mile city. We need affordable living, improvements and security for the next hundred or more years without a huge population growth. It appears mayor Lurie is selling us out instead of rebuilding the city to what it used to be, as he promised while running for office. If you go to Europe you can see their history everywhere. They don't demolish they improve their buildings without wasting the beautiful architecture. This is how san Francisco was in the past. At least postpone the January 2026 date and include all San Franciscans in decisions of their neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Ginger Pepper
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** dunetansy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Gaar
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:13:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greg Gaar
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jun ishimuro
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:28:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

This plan will destroy the unique neighghborhood characters of 24th Street near where I live. Residents have made effort for decade to 24th street shopping areas unique with independently owned businesses.
This plan also do not address the affordability and adding market rate condominiums will only displace existing residents under rent control. We can not allow real estate developers to destroy our city's unique beauty - which is our city's sustainable resource which produce money and jobs through our city's tourism.

Sincerely,
jun ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of n d
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:31:43 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
n d

**From:** sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:38:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Please help keep our neighborhoods and stop Senator Wiener's horrible plan to destroy our living spaces.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

How would you feel if a four to six story building becomes your neighbor?

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn

**From:** rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rita Pisciotta
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 7:53:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** amgodman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Aaron Goodman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 8:05:20 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Parkmerced was one of wieners pushed density projects. It ignored obsolescence and feasibility financially. It ignored preservation and infill based options that would have allowed density and transit solutions. It ignored the other domino impacts of adjacent redevelopment institutional growth and the displacement and loss of rent controlled housing to sfsu-csu. It ignored the 11 unretrofitted towers and CEQA analysis of better alternatives and options submitted to the S.F. planning department supervisors and mayor with adequate time to meet and adjust with the owner and architectural team. They ignored everything and went forward with similar last minute legislation late at night without review or discussion (see the film "who killed Parkmerced?" No neighborhood is safe or building protected when you allow such rampant and unenvironmental demolition of sound rent controlled housing……. There was no plan, only green-$-greed…….

Sincerely,
Aaron Goodman
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** williamskewescox@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Skewes-Cox
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 8:50:22 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My family has lived in Cow Hollow since 1960 and across 4 generations. We are horrified by the change in character that could result from these changes. People travel from all over the world to see our human scale neighborhoods. We must protect them not destroy them!

Sincerely,
William Skewes-Cox
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** gilladmin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of pamela gill
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 8:53:33 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want more input before deciding which side I am on. Please see to it that the people of San Francisco and those who love this city need to consider the hard facts, and at the moment, we don't have those hard facts.

As a San Franciscan, I don't know if I oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I wonder about:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
pamela gill
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 9:29:18 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have been  residing in San Francisco since the 1980's.  My children were both born here at Children's Hospital on California street and they are grown now but still reside in the City.  It is our home and we love it.  I have seen many changes to our beloved City and it is not change I'm concerned with but the scale and magnitude of the proposed developments and extreme upzoning that has me and many other neighbors worried and frankly,  pissed off.

Please consider our concerns.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe

**From:** alecd69@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alexander Davis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:23:39 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a long-time San Franciscan, and I'm strongly opposed to Mayor Lurie's upzoning push and Senator Wiener's SB 79. The current plan rewards tearing down existing homes, drives out renters and small neighborhood businesses, and fast-tracks a future of unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors that most of us will never be able to live in. That's not "housing policy." That's displacement with better PR.

What I'm asking you to do:

Scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps. Dramatically. Start with what's actually required—not a speculative land rush.

Back the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder, and Chen opposing SB 79. Stand with neighborhoods, not demolition incentives.

Tell Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney: Vote NO on SB 79. No blank check for permanent land-use changes without affordability or anti-displacement protections.

Push to postpone the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline. Rushing irreversible zoning is how communities get erased.

Why this matters:
SB 79 + the Mayor's maps = permanent, one-way changes to how San Francisco grows—far beyond what's required and with zero affordability guarantees. Once the zoning changes, we don't get our neighborhoods back. This clears a path for mass demolition and luxury towers that serve developers and billionaire investors while cutting local residents out of the conversation. If planning doesn't protect the people who actually live here, it's not planning—it's displacement dressed up as "growth."

Sincerely,
Alexander Davis
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** crimlaw5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gail Harper
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:25:51 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and longtime resident of North Beach, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Gail Harper
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:43:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Trickle down housing doesn't work. Stand up to the developers and protect San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 2:35:43 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Polesky
San Francisco, CA 94107

**From:** patrica_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 3:19:36 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** angelanealgrove@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of angela Grove
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:16:40 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, living in Cow Hollow I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Lets not ruin San Francisco by going back to the damage done in the 60's

Sincerely,
angela Grove
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 7:38:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please object to Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Alice Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** dleuer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis Leuer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 8:22:23 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dennis Leuer
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** maria.bugarin7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Bugarin
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 9:54:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have been a North Beach resident for over 35 years. I am a teacher with SFUSD. At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better.

Sincerely,
Mary Bugarin
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** apatterson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arthur Patterson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 9:54:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Arthur Patterson
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** Mikalis.Faklys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Faklis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:20:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Faklis
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** artartarta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of michael pedroni
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:22:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
michael pedroni
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:41:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement and it is irresponsible because it makes false promises and does not recognize the past valuable contributions of the very residents and businesses that built community and commerce in San Francisco.

The maps I have seen layer numerous zoning changes on existing established neighborhoods, ignore the value of preserving significant open space and architectural elements, place undue negative emphasis on archaic exclusionary policies that haven't been enforced in decades and never will be, and dismiss appeals by neighborhood groups to participate in proposed changes.

In addition, having been born in San Francisco in 1953, I have resided here in apartments, flats, and single family homes, each of which were appropriate to the various stages of my work, my financial situation, and my personal life. I have witnessed the results of both positive and disastrous decisions in San Francisco from the time my immigrant grandparents relocated here to present day when my 14 year old grandson begins his 9th grade term in SFUSD. Our family had a barber shop on Holloway Avenue in a mixed use building, worked in retail and finance and education, pooled the salaries of 3 adults working full time to finance the purchase of a home, and continue to use public transportation in its many forms to this day. It is unnecessarily and Ill-advised to move ahead with rezoning and density decontrol changes as currently proposed.

Please resist pressure from Sacramento. Don't diminish what San Francisco offers to all residents by imposing policies that will in the end make housing more restrictive and less affordable.

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** soong.sharon@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Soong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 11:32:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Enacting this bill will destroy the character of San Francisco. Our home is over 120 years old, as are most of the homes in my area. I can't imagine what it would be like to have a huge, ugly highrise right next to us. People travel here from all over the world to enjoy San Francisco's unique beauty. This upzoning will destroy tourism as well. When is a city saturated? When is enough, enough? We struggle to have infrastructure for the people we have now. We can't support tens of thousands more. We just can't. We voted for Weiner (several times) and Lurie and I cannot tell you how disappointed in them we are.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sharon Soong
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kathyhoward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Howard
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 12:36:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long-time San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Downtown is dead, and the neighborhood commercial districts are full of life. And yet, you want to turn all of SF into what downtown looks like now. This does not make sense.

Please:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Katherine Howard
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** susanevans822@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Evans
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 1:16:28 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Evans
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** chr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Russell
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 1:25:35 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Christine Russell

**From:** denolacarole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carole De Nola
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 1:40:42 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carole De Nola
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** kline.jb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeffrey Kline
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Wednesday, July 16, 2025 2:02:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I really hope that all of you have read some works by Jane Jacobs, who along with Lewis Mumford, is considered a founder of the New Urbanist movement. According to her ThoughtCo. biography "(s)he supported bottom-up community planning, relying on the wisdom of those who lived in the neighborhoods to know what would best suit the location.". A famous Jacobs' quote: "“There is no logic that can be superimposed on the city; people make it, and it is to them, not buildings, that we must fit our plans.”. Please listen to the majority of the people who live in and make this city of San Francisco, and reconsider this flawed upzoning plan, which will not-- and cannot-- solve the urgent problem of a lack of affordable housing, but will open the door to massive demolition and higher rise (re-)development that will destroy the character and historic vibrancy of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Kline

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250727 - 30 letters |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 15, 2025 1:41:45 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 30 letters.pdf |

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 30 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250700 - Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976.

File No. 250701 - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C

(Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

File No. 250727 - Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill 79 (Wiener) and similar future legislation, unless amended to give Local governments adequate ability to formulate local plans through its local legislative process, in which local governments and residents have adequate review and oversight of community planning, including affordability requirements, and residential and commercial tenant protections.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office*

*does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** jacquelineshelton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jacqueline Shelton
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:01:56 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please listen to your constituents who oppose these measures.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Shelton
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:02:27 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** marcrabideau@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marc Joseph Rabideau
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:03:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marc Joseph Rabideau
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** jvistnes1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Vistnes
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:09:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I can't agree more with the message from Neighborhoods United SF. I am completely distressed by the upzoning map. I can't understand why you want to ruin San Francisco. The high rises on Lombard Street from Laguna to the east are particularly upsetting. They will cut off views of half of what makes San Francisco "The City by the Bay" for tourists and residents alike. It is like putting the Fontana Towers all along one of the prettiest parts of San Francisco - blocking views so that developers can see apartments for many millions of dollars. Please put a stop to this!!!!

Sincerely,
Jessica Vistnes
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** robosborn415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Osborn
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:11:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Osborn
San Francisco, CA 94131

**From:** reginasneed@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Regina Sneed
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:12:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- allow for more community input into the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability.

As a charter city, I do not support SB 79 and think San Francisco needs an exemption from its provisions which would allow for a better plan for increasing housing in the city.

Sincerely,
Regina Sneed
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** dongaj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Albert Dong
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:13:54 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Albert Dong
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** agandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ader gandi
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:00 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I live in Russian Hill, a neighborhood with charm and love. The new zoning plan will destroy this beautiful neighborhood.

Sincerely,
ader gandi
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** mopugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Pugh
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:16 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mark Pugh
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** danolley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Nolley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan again since 1984 (and, I received my BA from SFSC in 1968), I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please cease and disist.

Sincerely,
David Nolley
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** gregory@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gregory Stevens
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:14:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Gregory Stevens
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:19:55 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mullholland
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:20:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. As SF history shows, each time the city government tried to "up zone" it destroyed a thriving neighborhood.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. No mention of low-income housing projects such as the one in North Beach on Bay Street.

SF does not need more housing, it needs the right housing. This is not being considered.

Sincerely,
Patrice Mullholland
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** campcollier86@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lori Collier
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:24:05 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lori Collier
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** mos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of m o"sullivan
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:24:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
m o'sullivan
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:26:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:27:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 32 year resident and renter in San Francisco, I strongly oppose Billionaire Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. San Francisco is one of the few cities left in this country with distinctive neighbors, and this short sighted cash grab turns it into another generic, completely unaffordable city. Not only is it bad for the people that call this place home, it's bad for tourism, which is still one of our greatest sources of revenue. Who wants to come to a city where the landmarks and charm are obscured by endless cookie cutter condos and office buildings. Gentrification isn't renewal, it's destruction, and the evidence is plain to see in countless other communities.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

It's time for a proposition that would remove large property owners and landlords like Scott Weiner and Dan Lurie from proposing these sorts of programs that they and their associates would directly profit from. There's a clear conflict of interest here.

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:27:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:29:50 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** kgolata@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathleen Golata
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:32:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

I am especially concerned due to the proposal to make North Beach an "historical district". I have very little information about this other than meetings that were dominated by the "pro" contingent. As a homeowner in North Beach for over 15 years, I see no benefit at all for myself and others like me. Most of the seniors in my neighborhood are unaware of the imminent changes.The only concrete information I received was from my insurance broker, who said the homeowners' insurance will be even more difficult to obtain.
Most of the benefits were for individuals who have owned their buildings for five years or fewer.
Last year my insurance company of 14 years arbitrarily cancelled my insurance, although there was no inspection, nor have I made any claims to the company. My insurance bill more than doubled.

As if this wasn't enough, now there are plans to further gentrify this neighborhood that I know and love.
Please do not change San Francisco into a playground for billionaires.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Golata
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** darcybrown7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Darcy Brown
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:35:48 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Darcy Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** kathylipscomb2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of kathy lipscomb
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:44:25 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
kathy lipscomb

**From:** verb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Verburg
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:46:54 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of one of San Francisco's oldest, most unique, and densest neighbhorhoods -- North Beach -- I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes demolishing existing homes, displacing renters and small businesses, and transforming our diverse, distinctive city into a labyrinth of luxury high-rise corridors affordable only by corporate investors and wealthy tourists.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Carol Verburg
San Francisco, CA 94133

**From:** sheila@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheila Fifer
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:57:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

And we would greatly appreciate your holding a meeting to discuss what will happen with the Little Sisters of the Poor property. Would it be possible to hold a neighborhood meeting there? If not, we live two blocks away and would be glad to host a meeting at our home at 32 6th Avenue.

Sincerely,
Sheila Fifer
San Francisco, CA 94118

**From:** kpscarr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Scarr
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 10:58:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I write to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Significantly scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Karen Scarr
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** platzman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Platzman
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:04:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I do not believe building towers 6/8/10 stories is the answer. it will destroy what makes Sf special. a tourist destination. a place people want to live. the answer is to allow building more easily and more efficiently. streamline the process. dont make it so hard. so bureaucratic. keep the heighten limits reasonable 4 stories and make the process easier . this will make development economically feasible and provide the units you need.

Sincerely,
Steven Platzman
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** nmorcom@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Morcom
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:07:18 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 30+ year resident of the Barbary Coast section of District 3 in San Francisco and I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

While San Francisco struggles to recover from the pandemic, our priorities should be on attracting tourism and businesses back to our city. These initiatives will destroy the attractiveness of the city to tourists and will do nothing to attract businesses.

Sincerely,
Neville Morcom
San Francisco, CA 94111

**From:** loanhound@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Russell Davis
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning & SB 79 [Files: 250700, 250701, and 250727]
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 11:14:38 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener's SB 79 and Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Remember what happened to the Fillmore in the 60's.  Stop this nonsense now.

Sincerely,
Russell Davis
San Francisco, CA 94127

**From:** M McF
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS); MahmoodStaff
**Subject:** opp;ose rezoning - it destorys the city and enriches international investors
**Date:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025 12:09:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. We cannot build our way out of a crisis created by wealth disparity. Rezoning simply exacerbates unaffordability by granting international investors the opportunity to destroy tour home place for personal gain.
Between 2000 -2020 home prices in San Francisco rose 413%l! The population did not increase four fold. What did increase was the number of wealthy people buying property as part of an LLC or private business, then writing it off as a business expense. The other increase was in the flow of investors that tax breaks and subsidies encouraged to buy and develop homes as part of investment portfolios.
I call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Support the resolution from Supervisors Chan, Fielder and Chen opposing SB 79
- Urge Assemblymembers Stefani and Haney to vote NO on SB 79
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Senator Wiener’s SB 79 and Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. If building more lowered prices, then empty offices would have been repurposed, vacant shopping malls redesigned, and housing built along 101 south of the city and near the tech hubs. That doesn't happen because investors and the politicians they purchased gain from the subsidies, tax breaks, and the destruction of strong communities.
Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.
Mary McFadden

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 5 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701 |
| **Date:** | Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:45:50 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 5 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 5 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

> **File No. 250700:** Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)
>
> **File No. 250701:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**
**San Francisco, CA 94102**
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

**From:** rhett@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhett Currier
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:31:40 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I live near Dolores Park, I think plans for development need to include retention of public spaces that get natural light all day, like Dolores Park.

Sincerely,
Rhett Currier
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Monday, July 7, 2025 10:38:48 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: This is a Draconian, sledgehammer method of addressing the housing crisis that will cause problems rather than solving them. It's essentially a blank check to developers to do virtually whatever they want. It will destroy the very qualities of the city that make so many people want to live here.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** douglasboszhardt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug Boszhardt
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Sunday, July 6, 2025 8:42:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: The vastly expanded height limits will do huge damage to my district, the Marina. The Marina is a district that is currently very family friendly. Many families struggle with the idea of moving to Marin, to further build family structure, and educate their kids. We stayed, as it is a fantastic neighborhood, but seriously weighed that decision. The sun filled Italian courtyards in the Marina are very unique. A special feature of living here.

You can blow it up, but there will be negative consequences. These tall buildings will make families deciding whether to raise their kids in the city, the Marina in particular, more difficult, Moving to the suburbs when kids are young will be even more attractive at the margin. Ask Gavin who left Pac Heights for Marin.

But the Marina is more family friendly with its architecturally closed off Italian courtyards. Closed off to the street beautiful courtyards is a unique Italianate fortress design. They were built for sun filled gardens, and safety, as they can't be entered from the street. Great for raising small kids. I hear kid laughter in the courtyard…all weekend long.

These proposed tall buildings will ruin the sun access for the marina neighborhood. The profiteering developers are takers, and will make a lot of money stealing sun and Golden Gate Bridge views. The Pac Height elite don't care… maybe they will even be investors in the development. I'm sure they will. But it's a shame if it happens. Done in the name of families…but that's rediculous as all those new condos with views ripping off existing families…will be owned by people over the bridge. The new development will be Pied-it-teirs for suburbanites. They will be crash pads in the city for wealthy commuters, or Silicon Valley money. Their kids will be in the burbs. Such a shame. Poor planning and knowledge, understanding by planners …as there are other places in the city to do this. The Marina will be less desirable for those starting a family here…and have them staying here, as we did. We Marina families, and the city as it has been, will loose. Developers and their investors…will win. The new condo owners

are not families with young kids.  But existing Marina families could leave, or just settle in Marin to begin with. To not understand this, is poor planning.

To summarize, the extreme proposed heights on Lombard is the issue, especially the massive heights  on the east end of Lombard. I strongly believe current height restrictions allow for development Lombard nicely. Have at it.

Sincerely,
Doug Boszhardt
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** gioconda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gioconda Corral
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:18:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Keep SF's perfect balance of city and nature feel in tact and please don't mess with its beauty and character. High buildings make more sense in South SF or in areas where tall buildings already exist. I am very concerned with over population, too much car traffic - air and noise pollution would be devastating affecting the feel of the city, the wildlife and nature.

Sincerely,
Gioconda Corral
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** patrica_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:31:04 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens. Certain elected legislators seem to be working for developers and not for the people they represent. Please put a stop to this. I live in district one and what's been done for example to the great highway is a disgrace. We have no escape right now, but somebody's getting some money and I think some of the elected legislators from back east don't understand that what's different about California so we actually could be near the ocean in an equitable way such as driving
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Board of Supervisors (BOS) |
| **To:** | BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides |
| **Cc:** | BOS-Operations; Carroll, John (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS) |
| **Subject:** | 8 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 250701 |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:18:53 PM |
| **Attachments:** | 8 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700_250701.pdf |

---

Hello,

Please see attached 8 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:*** *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** tab@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Teresa Butler
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 9:31:37 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Let the sun shine in the Outer Sunset and Outer Richmond. Do not put such high buildings past Sunset Blvd. Heights over 4-stories deface this Outer Sunset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; our coastal topography should be designated as a National Treasure and a San Francisco National Treasure, and it should be protected. Tourists love our coastline. Protect it. Tell the building industry and Scott Wiener 'No!'

Sincerely,
Teresa Butler
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** mopugh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Pugh
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 10:56:18 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Mark Pugh
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** dldobson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Dobson
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:38:05 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As someone who has lived a block away from Union St. for decades, I am appalled by this decision to drastically alter the ambience of Union Street and Chestnut Street. I voted Mr. Lurie for several reasons, including the fact that he lived in the area and appreciates its beauty. I believe his plans will drastically change the appearance and ambience of the area for the worse.

Sincerely,
Donna Dobson
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** padysplace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luis Pine
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:31:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Please reduce the allowable height on Judah St. from Sunset Blvd. to 47th to higher than 60' and on Irving and Lincoln reduce heights to no higher than 48' (so we can get light in the part and the neighborhood in the fall and the winter). This Outer Sunset area is an area of outstanding natural beauty where tourists delight in the amount of sunlight it offers. Please do not ruin the tourism industry in favor of the construction industry or our city will lose greatly.

Sincerely,
Luis Pine
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** kristen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kristen Borsetti
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:45:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

Instead of keeping the generic script sent to us regarding our opposition, I want to add how a world.class process can take place. In the updates we receoas residents, we are shown only two things: 1) a map where the impact locations will be (in this case D20 along Lombard and Fillmore), and 2) a very simplified drawing of what 'tall buidlings' would look like. This does not detail how the neighborhoods will be transformed and individuals supported - both families and business owners - with their needs to make this a vibrant community. This is one dimensional at best.

Having traveled and lived in other parts of the world, I have seen and felt the positive impact of world class planning. Look at Singapore. On June 25, they just launched their 2025 draft master plan, which was a result of engaging over 220k community members over a two year review. The detailed plan, which makes the SF planning process look like an elementary school process, goes into detail on: 1) engagement journey for creating the plan, 2) developing a healthy/happy city, 3) Enabling Sustainable Growth, 4) Demonstrating the importance of community ideas and input, 5) detailing supporting transportation infrastructure, 6) ensuring the impact fits into the overall heritage and narrative of the city, and 7) promoting sustainable growth and green spaces. You can access more information here: A Singapore that is liveable, inclusive and endearing for generations: URA unveils Draft Master Plan 2025
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://share.google/Hk0LUnbqUwyFz3cNE___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzovNjFiNTNmNGI1OTVkYjIxMzYkYTg2OTUwOGU3ZmJlZTo3OmM3OGQ6ZGZmMGQ5YTNiMmEwNTUyYzZjOWY4YmRhYmRkZDg3OGEyNWM2ZTU1YWYzZWM0MDgyMzMyMDE3NzY3ZDUyODZkNTpwOlQ6Tg

Mayor Lurie and his team are talented enough to understand what a comprehensive review looks like and how they have fallen short. We, as a community, deserve better and thoughtful planning to this change and impact.

Sincerely,
Kristen Borsetti
San Francisco, CA 94123

**From:** marchand.philippe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philippe Marchand
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 5:47:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want to express my support for changes to zoning that would lead to more medium-density options for families using walking and transit, especially in the large portions of the city currently restricted to single homes.

I moved here with my family in 2022, I am not a homeowner, and I use walking and transit to get around the city and take my children to/from school on weekdays. As a new resident of SF, I was surprised by just how much of the housing in residential neighborhoods was composed of single homes, with so much of the built spaces occupied by garages. Having previously lived in Montreal, Canada, I had an image of a residential urban neighborhoods primarily composed of small multiplex units, which despite unequivocally worse weather than SF, made those neighborhoods less car-reliant.

To be clear: I support rent control, affordable housing, and expansion of transit and pedestrian-friendly programs to match development, and I think it's important for renting families to have a voice in this issue, especially if they don't fit in the dominant debate between real-estate interests and landowners trying to maintain their "property values" (i.e. the group whose webform I'm using to send this).

Sincerely,
Philippe Marchand
San Francisco, CA 94124

**From:** yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Sunday, June 29, 2025 3:18:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident without a car, I rely on the small shops in haight street and the neighborhood to fulfill my shopping needs.
Many of these shops already contend with high rents and competition from Amazon and online tech delivery companies. Up zoning can only intensify the pressures on them, as the value of land will incentivize property owners to empty their buildings in favor of large developers.
At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, I, along with my fellow a. Franciscans, voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan hands over more power to developers, and disempowers residents.

Why rush to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality?

The mandate must be
challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Alice Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** sfsarnot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Arnot
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)
**Subject:** URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 10:54:46 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Arnot
San Francisco, CA 94109