

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: File 220736 vacate of streets - Parkmerced (comment) SFBOS meeting.  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 4:36:37 PM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the communication below regarding:

File No. 220736 - Street and Public Service Easement Vacation Order – Parkmerced Development Project

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  
(415) 554-5184 | (415) 554-5163  
[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Aaron Goodman <[amgodman@yahoo.com](mailto:amgodman@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 7:32 AM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: File 220736 vacate of streets - Parkmerced (comment) SFBOS meeting.

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

SFBOS

I am unable to attend the hearing but wish to submit comments on the SFBOS hearing on the vacate of streets in parkmerced for first phase work on the site.

1) the muni M line has not developed far or fast enough to consider a direct link to Daly City Bart vs a dog-leg into parkmerced. Too much money spent downtown has crippled any serious west side transit planning and the lack of an L taraval extension up sloat or serious link of transit north to south along sunset or south along the west side of the three major developments coupled with westside multiple housing projects is a huge error in getting the transit systems online to promote use of them during construction phases at parkmerced for workers to get to any sites in the area.

2) the proposed regrading is a huge environmental impact including heavy trucks and methane gas release. The destruction of sound housing in the townhomes with no real reports of obsolescence and opportunity to preserve or provide an alternative infill option at this late stage due to ignoring the 11 unretrofitted towers and proposed towers next to dune and impacted earthquake prior towers at 55 Chumaseo and the unknown soil conditions at the 1952 interchange down brotherhood way.

3) no serious consideration of sfsu's enrollment changes and impacts on rent controlled housing was ever seriously investigated post the land grab of UPN and UPS which caused impacts to families and seniors living in parkmerced and stonestown apartments. Many people live in RVs and cannot afford new sfsu housing prices. Nor the flipped costs of units in parkmerced as students leave campus and units get renovated and increased in pricing.

4) the back room negotiations of Chiu with the developer has never been tested legally and if the transition to new ownership occurs post construction with multiple new buildings by different architects what occurs when they try to parcel sites off and sell and the rent controlled protections are challenged? There are serious impacts long range that were used in agreements for other large scale sites. The statements that these agreements are iron-clad may not hold water long range so the concerns for rent controlled housing and the rights of renters citywide becomes a serious concern long term.

5) why should st Francis woods be protected and the housing that was masterplan Ed and developed with 6 national organizations citing the need for protection of the site ignored. Seems that profit vs people still motivates the roles politicians play and the real need for housing is only tongue in cheek when large swaths of housing for millionaires is protected lands without any options for density and the poorer neighborhoods or renters are bulldozed constantly for 20-30 years of construction.

6) finances - what has been shown by the developers on their honesty to follow through on anything besides profits? Robert Rosania was only interested in "the preservation of my money" not the people who lived there. As supervisors your utmost concern is the rights and protections of people living in this city. Have you done the right thing in going forward on this project when vacancy rates of 30% or more exist in parkmerced currently and SFSU reports similar lacking enrollment and vacancies due to rising costs.

Think hard on these issues. We don't need a traffic construction Armageddon on the west side we need transit solutions up front housing protections and rental housing to be sustainably preserved and restored and some common sense injected into the building up of San Francisco.

When empty lots and single story buildings exist on many adjacent and near sites in D7 there are better ways to approve housing proposals and in phases and plans that get transit to the forefront lessen environmental methane release and solve our housing issues without destroying entire neighborhoods..

It will be a sad day when the bulldozers start to tear out streets. Even sadder to know that plans for a new era missed the environmental mark by a long and large amount. I just have to look at street trees and lacking efforts at parkmerced the entire time their proposa went forward to know that maintenance and care was not at g forefront or their plans only "green-\$-greed" the real dreams of the developer and sfsu in their land grabs on the west side....

Regards

Aaron Goodman D11

Cc: SF Planning Dept Director / SFMTA Director / Mayor London Breed

Sent from my iPhone

## **Parkmerced Action Coalition**

# **RESOLUTION TO STOP THE CONSTRUCTION OF PARCELS A, B, C AND D AT PARKMERCED**

**Whereas,** San Francisco has more people leaving the City than any other place in the nation, 1

**Whereas,** Parkmerced presently has a vacancy rate of 30%,

**Whereas,** recently it has been reported that 40,000 homes or condominiums are vacant, 2

**Whereas,** taking a loan today for construction will be more expensive because of the rise in interest making new construction more expensive than any time in recent history, 3

**Whereas,** expensive new construction is likely to have even fewer tenants than the existing housing stock in Parkmerced,

**Whereas,** working remotely in San Francisco has made the need to live in San Francisco unnecessary, 4

**Whereas,** building unnecessary construction that lies vacant for months or years can cause a recession,

**Whereas,** Parkmerced should be considered a historical monument, 5

**We Resolve,** that the construction of housing in the development of Parkmerced is no longer feasible after the COVID-19 pandemic,

**We Further Resolve,** any future construction in Parkmerced, Balboa Reservoir, Treasure Island or Hunters Point should occur only when the vacancy rates are no longer as high as they are today,

**We Further Resolve,** that the City should petition the State to relieve us from the unrealistic burden of providing 800 units of housing a year or 8,000 units of housing every 10 years.

**PO BOX 320445, San Francisco, CA 94132**

**FOOT NOTES:**

1. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-07-29/california-exodus-continues-l-a-san-francisco-lead-the-way>
2. <https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/how-many-vacant-homes-are-there-in-San-Francisco-16822916.php>
3. <https://www.nbcdfw.com/news/local/construction-costs-hit-highest-spike-in-50-years/2891677/>
4. <https://nypost.com/2022/07/18/san-francisco-mayor-worried-residents-leaving-working-from-home/>
5. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parkmerced, San Francisco](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parkmerced,_San_Francisco)