

From: [Stuart Flashman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reply to Response of Bridge Housing to Appeal letter
Date: Monday, August 10, 2020 4:38:42 PM
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-1.png](#)

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

Bridge Housing attempts to assert that the evidence shows that a 100% affordable housing project would be infeasible for the same reasons that the 800 unit “Alternative B” analyzed in the FSEIR is infeasible. Bridge’s analysis is wrong.

- 1) Unlike the 800 unit Alternative B, the proposed 100% affordable project would only use the southern half of the reservoir parcel. There would be NO infrastructure improvements in the Northern half, The horizontal infrastructure costs Bridge assumes are therefore grossly overinflated. (It would also greatly reduce the direct and cumulative construction noise impacts on sensitive receptors north of the project site.)
- 2) Unlike the 800 unit Alternative B, a 100% affordable project, especially one focused on CCSF students and those working at or near CCSF, would need no parking structure, even further reducing project costs. (It would also greatly reduce the project’s direct and cumulative traffic and transit impacts)
- 3) Unlike the 800 unit Alternative B, a 100% affordable project, located only in the southern half of the site, and with no off street parking, would not need to extend Lee Street. Thus the horizontal infrastructure costs would be further reduced. (It would also eliminate the proposed projects’ direct and cumulative significant impacts on freight and passenger loading and on bicyclist safety.)
- 4) Whether the 100% affordable alternative would include a park, childcare center, or other amenities should not be assumed. A 100% affordable project might be considered a sufficient public benefit in itself.

In short, Bridge has constructed a straw man to rip apart. Its analysis says nothing about the feasibility of a 500 unit 100% affordable housing project located solely in the southern half of the site. In order for the feasibility (and potential impact) of a 500 units 100% affordable housing project to be determined, they need to be studied in a revised supplemental EIR.

Environmental, Land Use, and Elections Law

Serving public interest and private clients since 1990

Stuart Flashman
Attorney

stu@stufash.com

Law Offices of Stuart Flashman

5626 Ocean View Drive
Oakland, CA 94618-1533

tel: (510) 652-5373

fax: (510) 652-5373

The information in this message is confidential information which may also be legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication to anyone other than the party for whom it is intended is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me immediately by telephone or return e-mail.
