File I	No.	230549

Committee Item	No.	
Board Item No.	37	

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _		Date:	
Board of Supe	ervisors Meeting	Date:	May 16, 2023
Cmte Board			
ROLB Y IN D NG G S C F A A	Notion Resolution Predinance Regislative Digest Rudget and Legislative Analyst Pouth Commission Report Production Form Repartment/Agency Cover Letter Route Budget Rudget	er and/	
OTHER			
	OS Ordinance No. 23-15 - 2/20/	15	
	016 General Election Results		
H H -			
H H -			
Prepared by:	Lisa Lew	Date:	_May 12, 2023
Prepared by:		Date:	

1	[Supporting San Francisco's Inflation Reduction Act Grant Request for Urban and Community Forestry]
2	
3	Resolution supporting San Francisco's grant application to the U.S. Department of
4	Agriculture in response to its Forest Service Urban and Community Forestry Inflation
5	Reduction Act Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), which would provide once-in-a-
6	generation funding to restore San Francisco's urban canopy damaged by recent
7	storms, as well as make long-term tree canopy investments in high-need environmental
8	justice communities in San Francisco, and create urban forestry and green workforce
9	opportunities.
10	
11	WHEREAS, In 2014, the San Francisco Planning Department, in collaboration with San
12	Francisco Public Works, the Urban Forestry Council, and Friends of the Urban Forest,
13	developed the City's Urban Forest Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees), which called for the creation
14	of a citywide street tree maintenance program and the planting of thousands of street trees to
15	promote public health, achieve greening equity and provide environmental benefits, which
16	was amended into the City's General Plan by reference and adopted by the Board of
17	Supervisors on February 20, 2015, and on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
18	File No. 141264, Ordinance No. 12-15, which is hereby declared to be a part of this
19	Resolution as if set forth fully herein; and
20	WHEREAS, On November 8, 2016, 79% of San Francisco voters passed Proposition
21	E's "Healthy Trees & Safe Sidewalks" ballot measure, which is on file with the Clerk of the
22	Board of Supervisors in File No. 230549, which is hereby declared to be a part of this
23	Resolution as if set forth fully herein; and
24	WHEREAS, 2016's Proposition E successfully shifted maintenance responsibility of
25	streets trees and root-damaged sidewalks from property owners to the City, and established

1	long-term dedicated funding via an annual \$19 million set-aside from the San Francisco
2	General Fund, adjusted annually based on the City's revenues, for the maintenance of those
3	125,000 street trees and trees on public schoolyards by San Francisco Public Works, as well
4	as the ongoing maintenance of all new street trees that are planted, in an acknowledgement
5	that a healthy urban canopy is critical public infrastructure which the City is committed to
6	investing in as a long-term public asset; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's 2017 Street Tree Census identified approximately 40,000 vacant and potential street tree planting spaces in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco Public Works' Street Tree Planting Strategy identified the need for planting 80,000 street trees over twenty years to achieve the Urban Forest Plan's goal of increasing the street tree population to 155,000 street trees, including replacing trees in existing empty sites due to natural mortality; and

WHEREAS, Maximizing trees throughout the public realm to sequester carbon is a key component of the Healthy Ecosystems Strategy of San Francisco's 2021 Climate Action Plan; and

WHEREAS, While Proposition E's annual set-aside dedicates a specific investment for ongoing tree maintenance, the ballot measure also explicitly restricts those dedicated tree maintenance funds from being used for new tree planting, and the City has limited additional funding sources to plant new trees at the scale needed to halt San Francisco's urban tree canopy decline, expand tree cover in low-canopy neighborhoods, and replace trees lost during storms; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco is projected to experience a variety of impacts associated with climate change, including an increase in extreme heat days and air quality hazards, the most impacted communities are those that already carry the heaviest health burdens; and

1	
2	ga
3	m
4	isl
5	th
6	
7	re
8	tre
9	re
10	
11	СО
12	Pla
13	
14	СО
15	to
16	the
17	
18	ev
19	gr
20	eq
21	fe

WHEREAS, Because trees capture and store carbon dioxide (the primary greenhouse gas responsible for climate change), planting in neighborhoods with fewer trees and those most prone to climate impacts will help create shade, reduce temperatures in "urban heat islands", and clean the air by absorbing pollutants and capturing particulate matter on leaves, thus helping to address issues of environmental injustice as a result of bad air quality; and

WHEREAS, The unprecedented storms this year required emergency response and repair work that included assessing, removing and mitigating damage to hundreds of downed trees, the removal of thousands of fallen branches and responding to hundreds of other tree-related emergencies; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco Public Works' Bureau of Urban Forestry (BUF) is committed to preserving and growing the City's tree canopy, as detailed in the 2021 BUF Planting Strategy abiding by the three principles: Preserve, Promote, and Advance; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's tree canopy coverage, defined as the amount of area covered by trees, lags behind most large U.S. cities at 13.7%, and planting street trees serves to preserve the existing canopy by replacing trees that must be removed as well as increasing the City's overall tree canopy with a diversity of new and durable tree species; and

WHEREAS, While BUF's Planting strategy has an overall goal of planting more trees in every community to connect all San Franciscans to the many benefits that street trees and greener neighborhoods provide, the 2021 Strategy has a specific emphasis on street tree equity, by prioritizing new tree planting in neighborhoods with the lowest tree canopy and fewest street tree, which, in San Francisco, often correlates to communities of color and low-income communities that experience disparities in public health and historic patterns of resource disinvestment; and

24

22

23

2	residents with limited access to job opportunities by providing employment and green
3	workforce training in arboriculture, tree planting and watering; and
4	WHEREAS, San Francisco is fortunate to have strong established community-based
5	organizations experienced in tree planting, tree watering and green workforce development
6	that could support the City's tree planting goals and implementation of the IRA grant if
7	awarded; and
8	WHEREAS, The City of San Francisco has recognized the importance of trees and has
9	established various programs, such as the Friends of the Urban Forest and the StreetTreeSF
10	program, to support tree planting and long-term care efforts; and
11	WHEREAS, The Federal Government passed the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022,
12	which included \$1 billion to provide competitive grants through the United States Forestry
13	Services' Urban and Community Forestry Program for tree planting and related activities, with
14	a priority for projects that benefit underserved populations; and
15	WHEREAS, San Francisco Public Works is preparing a \$50 million grant application
16	due on June 1, 2023, to dramatically upscale street tree planting over a five-year period in
17	collaboration with community partners with a focus on green jobs creation, workforce
18	development and greening underserved communities; now, therefore, be it
19	RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors supports the City's grant
20	application to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in response to its Forest Service Urban and
21	Community Forestry Inflation Reduction Act Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), which
22	would provide once-in-a-generation funding to restore San Francisco's urban canopy
23	damaged by recent storms, as well as make long-term tree canopy investments in high-need
24	environmental justice communities in San Francisco, and create urban forestry and green

WHEREAS, San Francisco Public Works' BUF Planting Strategy also seeks to benefit

workforce opportunities.

25

Ordinance amending the General Plan by amending Policy 3.6 of the Recreation and Open Space Element to reflect the adoption by reference of the Urban Forest Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees); affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act, and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

[General Plan Amendments - Urban Forest Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees)]

NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font.

Additions to Codes are in single-underline italics Times New Roman font.

Deletions to Codes are in strikethrough italics Times New Roman font.

Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.

Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font.

Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco: Section 1. Findings.

- A. Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for approval or rejection, proposed amendments to the General Plan.
- B. On December 9, 2014, the Board of Supervisors received from the Planning Department a proposed General Plan amendment which amends Policy 3.6 of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) to reflect the adoption by reference of the Urban Forest Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees).
- C. Section 4.105 of the City Charter further provides that if the Board of Supervisors fails to Act within 90 days of receipt of the proposed General Plan amendment, then the proposed amendment shall be deemed approved.

- D. San Francisco Planning Code Section 340 provides that an amendment to the General Plan may be initiated by a resolution of intention by the Planning Commission, which refers to, and incorporates by reference, the proposed General Plan amendment. Section 340 further provides that Planning Commission shall adopt the proposed General Plan amendment after a public hearing if it finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendment or any part thereof. If adopted by the Commission in whole or in part, the proposed amendment shall be presented to the Board of Supervisors, which may approve or reject the amendment by a majority vote.
- E. On October 9, 2014 the Planning Commission initiated the adoption of the General Plan amendment amending Policy 3.6 of the ROSE, at a duly noticed public hearing.
- F. On July 24, 2014, the Environmental Planning Section of the Planning Department determined that the proposed General Plan amendment was categorically exempt from environmental review under Classes 4 and 8 (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15304(b) and 15308).
- G. The Planning Commission, in Resolution 19281, found that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare required the proposed General Plan amendment. The letter from the Planning Department transmitting the proposed General Plan amendment to the Board of Supervisors, the environmental determination, and the Planning Commission Resolution approving proposed General Plan amendment is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No 141264. These and any and all documents referenced in this Ordinance have been made available to, and have been reviewed by, the Board of Supervisors, and may be found in either the files of the City Planning Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street in San Francisco, or in Board File No. 141264 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco.

H. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered all the documents mentioned above, and hereby adopts as its own and incorporates by reference the Planning Department's environmental determination as though it were fully set forth in this Ordinance.

- I. The Board of Supervisors finds, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, that the General Plan amendment set forth in the documents on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No.141264 will serve the public necessity, convenience and general welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 19281 and incorporates those reasons herein by reference.
- J. The Board of Supervisors finds that the General Plan amendment as set forth in the documents on file with the Clerk of the Board in Board File No.141264, is in conformity with the General Plan and the eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 19281. The Board hereby adopts these findings and incorporates them herein by reference.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors hereby amends the San Francisco General Plan by adopting the amendment to Policy 3.6 of the ROSE, as recommended to the Board of Supervisors by the Planning Commission on November 20, 2014, and referred to above.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM: DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By:

ANDREA RUIZ-ESQUIDE Deputy City Attorney

n:\iand\as2014\1100080\00960851.doc



City and County of San Francisco Tails

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Ordinance

File Number: 141264

Date Passed: February 10, 2015

Ordinance amending the General Plan by amending Policy 3.6 of the Recreation and Open Space Element to reflect the adoption by reference of the Urban Forest Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees); affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

January 26, 2015 Land Use and Economic Development Committee - RECOMMENDED

February 03, 2015 Board of Supervisors - PASSED, ON FIRST READING

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Christensen, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

February 10, 2015 Board of Supervisors - FINALLY PASSED

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Christensen, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

File No. 141264

I hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was FINALLY PASSED on 2/10/2015 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

> Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

Date Approved



November 8, 2016 Final Election Results

DEM - KAMALA D. HARRIS	286,723	77.98%
DEM - LORETTA L. SANCHEZ	80,985	22.02%
Total	367,708	100%
Under Votes	46,255	**************************************
Over Votes	565	

Resources and tools

Back to top

Register to Vote

U.S. Representative, District 12

Ways to vote

	Voter	portal	Ballots cast	Percentage	
DEM - NANCY PELOSI	rst t t t		274,035	80.87%	
NPP - PRESTON PICUS	District	lookup	64,810	19.13%	
Total			338,845	100%	
Under Votes			29,471		
Over Votes	Da	ta	130		

Maps

Back to top

Results

U.S. Representative, District 13

Future elections

		Ballots cast	Percentage
REP - SUE CARO	Contact	0	0%
DEM - BARBARA LEE		0	0%
Total	5-554-4375 415-554-4367	0	0%
	l: 415-554-4366	0	
Over Votes Filipino	: 415-554-4310	0	

TTY: (415) 554-4386

Back to top

Fax: (415) 554-7344

U.S. Representative, District 14

SFVote@sfgov.org

		,	Ballots cast	Percentage
DEM - JACKIE SPEIER			34,294	83.65%
REP - ANGEL CARDENAS	(Fac	ebook	6,702	16.35%
Total	. 7000040		40,996	100%
Under Votes	(<u>C</u>) Ins	agram 	5,074	

		Ballots cast	Percentage	
	VICTOR HWANG	217,689	65.05%	
	PAUL HENDERSON	116,937	34.95%	
	Total	334,626	100%	
	Under Votes	79,487		
-	Over Votes	415		

Member, Board of Education

	Ballots cast	Percentage
MATT HANEY	175,803	18.89%
MARK SANCHEZ	155,706	16.73%
STEVON COOK	152,335	16.37%
RACHEL NORTON	129,012	13.86%
JILL WYNNS	94,571	10.16%
TREVOR MCNEIL	86,233	9.27%
PHIL KIM	65,045	6.99%
IAN KALIN	44,788	4.81%
ROB GELLER	25,617	2.75%
WRITE-IN	1,482	0.16%
Total	930,592	100%
Under Votes	723,716	
Over Votes	3,804	

Back to top

Member, Community College Board

	Ballots cast	Percentage	
SHANELL WILLIAMS	191,317	23.77%	
RAFAEL MANDELMAN	177,436	22.05%	
ALEX RANDOLPH	156,306	19.42%	į
TOM TEMPRANO	142,452	17.7%	

Under Votes	4,729	
Over Votes	23	

Board of Supervisors, District 5

·	Ballots cast	Percentage
LONDON BREED	21,318	51.91%
DEAN PRESTON	19,534	47.56%
WRITE-IN	218	0.53%
Total	41,070	100%
Under Votes	4,417	
Over Votes	44	

Back to top

Board of Supervisors, District 7

	Ballots	cast	Percentage
NORMAN YEE		14,154	40.13%
JOEL ENGARDIO		7,630	21.63%
BEN MATRANGA		6,475	18.36%
JOHN FARRELL		4,927	13.97%
MIKE YOUNG		1,995	5.66%
WRITE-IN		93	0.26%
Total		35,274	100%
Under Votes		4,084	
Over Votes		128	

Back to top

Board of Supervisors, District 9

	Ballots cast	Percentage
HILLARY RONEN	18,335	57.22%
JOSHUA ARCE	9,612	30%

BART Director, District 9

	Ballots cast	Percentage
BEVAN DUFTY	91,763	60.39%
GWYNETH BORDEN	48,970	32.23%
MICHAEL PETRELIS	10,499	6.91%
WRITE-IN	723	0.48%
Total ·	151,955	100%
Under Votes	48,325	
Over Votes	441	

Back to top

State Proposition 51 - School Bonds. Funding For K-12 School And Community College Facilities. Initiative Statute.

▶ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage
Yes	253,655	66.75%
No	126,327	33.25%
Total	379,982	100%
Under Votes	30,799	
Over Votes	232	

Back to top

State Proposition 52 - Medi-cal Hospital Fee Program. Initiative Constitutional Amendment And Statute.

,			
	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	297,714	79.24%	
No	77,996	20.76%	
Total	375,710	100%	
Under Votes	35,149		

Over Votes 241

Back to top

State Proposition 56 - Cigarette Tax To Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research, And Law Enforcement. Initiative Constitutional Amendment And Statute.

► more

	Ballo	ts cast	Percentage	
Yes		323,192	81.49%	
No		73,408	18.51%	
Total		396,600	100%	
Under Votes		14,277		
Over Votes		136		

Back to top

State Proposition 57 - Criminal Sentences. Parole. Juvenile Criminal Proceedings And Sentencing. Initiative Constitutional Amendment And Statute.

➤ more

		Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes		314,007	82.6%	
No		66,162	17.4%	
Total Cotal		380,169	100%	
Jnder Votes		30,678		
Over Votes	A Commission of the Commission	166		

Back to top

State Proposition 58 - English Proficiency. Multilingual Education. Initiative Statute.

P Hore			
	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	330,471	87.03%	
No	49,257	12.97%	
Total	379,728	100%	
Under Votes Under Votes	31.194		

	1	
Over Votes	252	

State Proposition 62 - Death Penalty. Initiative Statute.

► more

	Ballots cast	Percentage
Yes	269,861	70.98%
No	110,308	29.02%
Total	380,169	100%
Under Votes	30,722	
Over Votes	122	

Back to top

State Proposition 63 - Firearms. Ammunition Sales. Initiative Statute.

▶ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage
Yes	336,849	85.47%
No	57,278	14.53%
Total	394,127	100%
Under Votes	17,044	
Over Votes	121	

Back to top

State Proposition 64 - Marijuana Legalization. Initiative Statute.

			Ballots cast	Percentage	
,	Yes		295,284	74,26%	
	No	,	102,347	25.74%	
	Total		397,631	100%	
ı	Jnder Votes		13,522		
1	Over Votes	3 	139		

School Measure A - School Bonds

▶ more

		Ballots cast	Percentage	l
Yes		289,351	79.79%	
No		73,307	20.21%	
Tot	al	362,658	100%	
Un	der Votes	48,309		
0٧	er Votes	325		ļ

This measure requires 55% affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

School Measure B - City College Parcel Tax

▶ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	291,565	80.62%	
No	70,099	19.38%	
Total	361,664	100%	
Under Votes	49,511		
Over Votes	117		

This measure requires 66%% affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure C - Loans to Finance Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing

➤ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage
Yes	270,113	76.7%
No .	82,035	23.3%
Total	352,148	100%
Under Votes	58,989	
Over Votes .	155	

This measure requires 66%% affirmative votes to pass.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure G - Police Oversight

▶ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	281,77	6 80.77%	
No	67,09	6 19.23%	
Total	348,87	2 100%	
Under Votes	62,21	5	
Over Votes	20	5	

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure H - Public Advocate

► more

	Ballots cast	Percentage
No	182,807	52.24%
Yes	167,114	47.76%
Total	349,921	100%
Under Votes	61,233	
Over Votes	138	

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure I - Funding for Seniors and Adults with Disabilities

➤ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	245,962	66.26%	
No	125,224	33.74%	
Total	371,186	100%	
Under Votes	38,735		

Under Votes	54,270	***************************************	
Over Votes	207		

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure M - Housing and Development Commission

▶ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage	
No	196,895	55.8%	
Yes	155,993	44.2%	
Total	352,888	100%	
Under Votes	57,027		
Over Votes	167		

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure N - Non-Citizen Voting in School Board Elections

▶ more

, more					
		E	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes			203,413	54.39%	
No			170,570	45.61%	
Tot	al		373,983	100%	
Un	der Votes	, de servicio de la companya de la c	35,860		
Ove	er Votes		239		

This measure requires.50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure O - Office Development in Candlestick Point and Hunters Point

	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	187,281	51.9%	
No	173,580	48.1%	

Yes	165,723	45.18%
Total	366,782	100%
Under Votes	43,136	
Over Votes	164	

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure S - Allocation of Hotel Tax Funds

▶ more

	Ballots cast	Percentage
Yes	233,099	63.71%
No	132,769	36.29%
Total	365,868	100%
Under Votes	44,061	
Over Votes -	153	

This measure requires 66%% affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure T - Restricting Gifts and Campaign Contributions from Lobbyists

▶ more

	Ba	allots cast	Percentage
Yes		313,411	87.26%
No		45,738	12.74%
Total		359,149	100%
Under Votes		50,721	
Over Votes		212	i galantina

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

Local Measure U - Affordable Housing Requirements for Market-Rate Development Projects

Community Services in Certain Neighborhoods

▶ more

7 11010			
	Ballots cast	Percentage	
Yes	211,168	59,86%	
No	141,578	40.14%	
Total	352,746	100%	
Under Votes	57,169		
Over Votes	167		

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

Back to top

District Measure RR - RART Safety Reliability and Traffic Relief

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)

I here	by subn	nit the following item for introduction (select only one):
	1.	For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
	2.	Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference) (Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
	3.	Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
	4.	Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor inquires"
	5.	City Attorney Request
	6.	Call File No. from Committee.
	7.	Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
	8.	Substitute Legislation File No.
	9.	Reactivate File No.
	10.	Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on
	al Plan Ye For Im	Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53): es No sperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)
Бропа	.01(8).	
Subje	ct:	
Long	Title or	text listed:
		Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: