To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>Carroll, John (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Major Issues with ABAG Housing Methodology for RHNA Allocations (File No. 200955)

Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 1:12:01 PM

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2020 7:19 PM

To: BOS-Supervisors

bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides

bos-

legislative aides@sfgov.org>

Subject: Major Issues with ABAG Housing Methodology for RHNA Allocations

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

TO: Board of Supervisors

I have dialed into the last three virtual meetings of the ABAG Housing Methodology Committee for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). These meetings were on August 28, September 4 and September 18, 2020.

There appear to be a number of major issues.

For its racial equity analysis, ABAG is using only African American and Latinx populations. ABAG has not included Asian populations.

ABAG has used job growth projections for San Francisco that do not factor in Prop E (March 2020) City Office Development Limit Initiative.

The RHNA cycle #5 allocation for ABAG was 187,990. For RHNA cycle #6 which begins on 2023 the allocation for ABAG is 441,176.

The major differences between the RHNA cycle #5 and cycle #6 allocations have been studied by the Embarcadero Institute.

The link below is to the Embarcadero Institute report titled Double Counting in the Latest Housing Needs Assessment.

http://embarcaderoinstitute.com/portfolio-items/double-counting-in-the-latest-housing-needs-assessment/

Eileen Boken

State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>Carroll, John (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Stop being NIMBYs (File No. 200955)

Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 1:11:39 PM

From: Joseph Lacap <jhlacap@ucdavis.edu> **Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2020 7:54 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Stop being NIMBYs

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

Dear BoS,

Please quit trying to get out of building more housing in SF. Your obsession with trying to make all housing projects 100% affordable is getting in your way of actually getting affordable housing units built. You know that market rate projects either include affordable units or pay for affordable units in other projects, right? We need more housing, period. The more of it is affordable the better, but the money for that has to come from somewhere, and the way things are now that 'somewhere' is market rate housing. So to maximize the number of affordable units we can build, you should be trying to maximize the number of market rate units built too. Don't support Supervisor Mar's regressive resolution. (https://www.sfexaminer.com/opinion/supervisor-mars-housing-resolution-will-exacerbate-san-franciscos-affordability-crisis/)

Thanks, Joe (D1)

--

Joseph Lacap
Graduate Student Researcher
University of California, Davis
http://mae.engr.ucdavis.edu/jwpark



To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>Carroll, John (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Reject anti-housing resolution (File No. 200955)

Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 1:11:06 PM

From: Donna Davies <dnndavies@gmail.com> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2020 9:09 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Reject anti-housing resolution

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

Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to reject Supervisor Mar's resolution as it will stop San Francisco from approving the greatly needed building of subsidized affordable housing.

Donna Davies

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>Carroll, John (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: GAO Committee: Sept 17th, Item 10, File 200955 - SUPPORT RESOLUTION

Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 8:23:21 AM

From: Kathy Howard <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 9:51 PM

To: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;

Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>

Cc: 'Ozzie Rohm' <ozzierohm@sbcglobal.net>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]

<mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine
(BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai,
Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS)
<norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: GAO Committee: Sept 17th, Item 10, File 200955 - SUPPORT RESOLUTION

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

Dear Supervisor Mar,

Thank you for introducing the resolution to urge ABAG and HCD to reduce San Francisco's RHNA goals for market rate housing in the upcoming RHNA cycle. The 50+ signers of this letter support this resolution.

The COVID crisis has resulted in an exodus of two classes of people from San Francisco:

- White-collar professionals who have been given the freedom to live anywhere while working from home.
- People who've lost their jobs and cannot stay at home hoping for a miracle to pay their rent or mortgage payment.

Even before the COVID crisis, there were clear signs of a slowdown. The number of entitlements at the end of 2019 was 2,944 units while the same number at the end of 2018 was 6,097 units. And this was before the economic calamity that has resulted from the pandemic.

We understand and support the need for more truly affordable housing. However, it is not cities that build housing; it is developers. Increasing market-rate housing will not result in producing the amount of affordable housing that San Francisco needs. In fact, it could have the opposite effect.

The unrealistic RHNA goals assume that we're still in the "go go days" of the tech boom and 3% unemployment rate. What is most disturbing is that in the event of NOT meeting our RHNA goals for market-rate housing, all such developments in RH zones will become by-right in San

Francisco thanks to the ill-advised state law, SB 35.

We appreciate that there have already been two hearings on this issue with extensive public comment. In the interests of saving time for the GAO Committee, instead of calling in, the following 50+ residents are signing this letter to support your resolution.

We also strongly urge the full Board of Supervisors to support this resolution.

Many thanks,

Richmond District Rising, District 1

Cira Marie Curri, District 1

Dr. Devorah Joseph, District 1

David Romano, District 1

Thomas Carey White III, District 1

Lori Brooke, District 2, President, Cow Hollow Association*

Anne Bertrand, District 2, Board Member, Cow Hollow Association*

Maurice Franco, District 2, the Marina

Ashley Wessinger, District 2, the Marina

Stephanie Peek, District 2, the Richmond District

Jerry & Sandra Dratler, District 2, the Richmond District

Kathleen Courtney, District 3, Russian Hill

Chris Bigelow, District 3, Russian Hill

Gerald P. Hurtado, District 3

Barbara Delaney, District 4

Larry Delaney, District 4

Lynn Hill, District 4

Katherine Howard, District 4

Dean McGrew, District 4

Shawna J. McGrew, District 4

Gregory Miller, District 4

Oskar Rosas, District 4

Jeff Rigo, District 4

Ken Rakow, District 4

Mary McNamara, District 4

Marlayne Morgan, District 5, Cathedral Hill

Tes Welborn, District 5, Haight Ashbury

Bruce Wolfe, District 5, Haight Ashbury

Denise Zietlow, District 5

George Wooding, District 7, Midtown Terrace

Karen Wood, District 7, Miraloma Park

Karen Breslin, District 7, Miraloma Park

Stephanie Costanza, District 7

Paul V. Simpson, District 7

Quentin L. Kopp, District 7

Bruce Bowen, District 8, Dolores Heights

Georgia Schuttish, District 8

Junona Jonas, District 8, Dolores Heights

Carolyn Kenady, District 8, Dolores Heights

Matt McCabe, District 8, Noe Valley
Gary Weiss, District 8, Corbett Heights
Anastasia Yovanopoulos, District 8, Noe Valley
Ozzie Rohm, District 8, Noe Valley
Alex Lemberg, District 8, President of the Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association*
Jennifer Fieber, District 9, Bernal Heights
Mari Eliza, District 9, President, East Mission Improvement Association*
Diane Wesley Smith, District 10
Arthur Feinstein, District 10
Linda Vallare-Johnson, District 10
Gloria Berry, District 10, Democratic County Central Committee*
William L. Martin, District 11
Roger Underhill, District 11

^{*} for identification purposes

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: support for resolution Item 16, file # 200955

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:29:00 PM

From: Kathy Lipscomb < kathylipscomb2@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:15 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: support for resolution Item 16, file # 200955

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

September 1, 2020

Board of Supervisors, (BOS), <u>board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org</u>> Please add this correspondence to the legislative file.

Support for Resolution Item 16, File # 200955

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of Resolution Item 16, File # 200955 regarding the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process and its implications for San Francisco.

It's time for the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to address the Bay Area's *true* unmet housing needs, and for San Francisco to do its part.

San Francisco needs to focus on homes for our essential workers and their families, especially those facing the "unmet needs" identified by ABAG of high housing costs and severe overcrowding.

We need to provide stable communities for Black and Brown residents facing gentrification and displacement pressures associated with runaway land speculation and unaffordable housing.

And we must work toward a truly racially integrated and just Bay Area, reversing the regional segregation pushing people of color to the edges of the metropolitan area, far from jobs, services and transit, that are the result of concentrating unaffordable housing in our central

cities.

Thank you, and please support Resolution 200955, urging ABAG to focus on unmet needs for housing affordable to low- and moderate-income residents, and to not increase San Francisco's annual allocation of unaffordable market-rate housing.

Kathy Lipscomb

member, Senior & Disability Action

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SFADC" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sfadc-forum+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sfadc-forum/CAOMfZHk-nw0avpCM4moGL%2BO7rp2AnYoRNE-gfzVt6EMTVQuAvQ%40mail.gmail.com.

2 Attachments

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Market Rate Housing + Build the west side Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 10:23:00 AM

From: Jordan Staniscia < jordan.staniscia@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 5:15 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani,

Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;

Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman
(BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff

(BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>

Subject: Market Rate Housing + Build the west side

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

To Mayor Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am a 28 year-old man who has lived in San Francisco for 10 years. The rent and cost to purchase a home or condo in San Francisco is known as being the highest globally. As I sit and listen to the board about to vote to ask for a smaller RHNA allocation, I can't help but think that San Francisco wants me to move away.

I want to have my children here. I want to start a family here. But at every turn the city government upholds the status quo—expensive housing for the rich and not building new housing here.

Market rate and affordability are all needed! I am a middle class citizen and I have competed constantly for the same housing with our less well off residents. I've lived in 100 year old buildings here and paid the same rent as a brand new building. This is an insane perversion of supply and demand.

Build. More. Housing. Period. All of it!

Build on the West side for once too and stop protecting the millionaires and billionaire land-owning class. Upzone every parcel! We can solve this if we'd only try. Don't force me out, please.

Jordan

From: <u>Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS)</u>
To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Gordon Mar"s Resolution for Affordable Housing First

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:30:00 PM

From: Barbara Delaney barbarabdelaney@gmail.com

Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 5:35 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Gordon Mar's Resolution for Affordable Housing First

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

Dear SF Supervisors,

I understand you will be voting tomorrow on Mr. Mar's resolution and that there will be another opportunity for public comment before the vote.

I called in last week to support this resolution and I stayed on the phone to hear what others were saying. I was struck by the enormous similarity among the callers who called to oppose the resolution - not only in the way they expressed themselves but also in their arguments. Many of them, for instance, seemed to imply that because San Francisco was not subject to fires and had clean air there needed to be more market rate housing so people outside the city could live here. I was speechless at the entitlement of those speakers who argued that those who can afford market rate housing should be able to buy it in SF to escape fire and bad air in the surrounding counties.

What also struck me, however, was the process of public comment in these days of Covid and remote hearings. While I'm

sure this allows more people to participate, it also allows for more fraud and deception. The similarity of the Opposed speakers made this all too obvious.

Here are the problems:

- 1. A caller can be whoever they want to be. They may not have any interest in the issue at all but someone who does may have paid them to call in, may have paid many of them to call in and provided them with scripts. I know that land use attorneys do this for planning commission hearings (they claim they will enlist "community and neighborhood support for your project") and it is just possible that this scam may have moved on to BOS meetings.
- 2. While it is wonderful that there is time for public comment, in this particular case the people who are most affected by the results are at opposite ends of the wealth spectrum. People who need affordable housing are the ones least likely to be able to take time out of their day to wait to speak at a BOS meeting (if they even knew one was going on or how to call in). The system is unfairly weighted against these people who need affordable housing but do not have the resources to make their voices heard. There is more than enough market rate housing in the city at the moment so why would anyone who didn't stand to profit from developing market rate housing bother to call in to oppose a resolution that required more affordable housing before more market rate housing?
- 3. Affordable housing is anathema to property developers which is why they so often opt to buy their way out of the affordable housing requirement in new construction (which is now so low as to be nearly useless). They are in it for the money, not for the economic diversity or the health of the city's housing stock for which they care nothing. Most of them don't even live here but they love the development friendly climate which allows them to harvest great profits at the expense of the people of San Francisco.

You are our representatives and we who need affordable housing are in all your districts. PLEASE SUPPORT GORDAN MAR'S RESOLUTION. Most of us have no one but you to look after our bigger picture interests. The developers opposing this resolution will exploit the limited available land in SF (with the help of ABAG and the RHNA quotas) for their own gain until there will be no place left to build affordable housing unless you require that affordable housing goals are met before any market rate housing is built. PLEASE HELP US. Thank you.

These are the words, opinions and pleas of

Barbara Delaney
Outer Sunset Activists United

Barbara Delaney

From: <u>anastasia Yovanopoulos</u>
To: <u>Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)</u>

Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS);

Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); BOS-

<u>Legislative Aides</u>

Subject: Fw: ABAG

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 5:31:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

As your District #8 constituent, I ask you to vote for the resolution co-sponsored by Supervisors Mar, Ronen, Walton, Fewer and Preston- "urging ABAG in the RHNA Process, to focus on unmet needs for affordable housing and maintain the current RHNA allocation level of above-moderate housing in San Francisco in its upcoming RHNA process".

The upcoming RHNA levels will increase to 2.35 higher! There is a risk that San Francisco will have its market-rate RHNA allocation double, or more, in order to absorb the overall regional determination increase resulting from under-performance by other cities.

In the current RHNA cycle, San Francisco has met and exceeded its RHNA for above-moderate/market rate housing, over-performing - by producing 140 % of the current eight- year goal which carries through 2021.

We've fallen significantly short of meeting our affordable housing RHNA allocation for low- and moderate-income goals, achieving only 37 % primarily due to lack of sufficient dedicated revenue sources.

• Developers choose to produce high-end or market rate units over low and moderate-income units because it is more profitable for their bottom-line, causing an imbalance in the supply side of affordable units.

Consider the fact that Planning Department's 2018 Housing Trends and Needs Report reflects that a majority of lower income homeowner households (earning <80% of AMI) are now cost burdened, and that overcrowding disproportionately impacts low-income households, including 12% of very low-income households and 10% of low-income households- Also consider the racial disparities that exist: Black, American Indian, and Latinx households are more severely burdened by housing costs and than White households.

San Francisco's resolution urges ABAG

• to focus on unmet RHNA needs for housing affordable to low- and moderate-

income residents experiencing cost burden and overcrowding in San Francisco

• to maintain and not increase the current eight-year allocation level of abovemoderate "market-rate" housing to San Francisco in the 2022-2030 RHNA cycle

Moreover, our city must not support a RHNA allocation that would trigger SB35 byright approvals for market-rate housing in San Francisco because it would further incentivize land speculation, associated with displacement and regional segregation.

An increase in the market-rate housing allocation to San Francisco in the ABAG RHNA process would likely trigger mandatory by-right approvals of all market-rate housing by state law due to Senate Bill 35 adopted in 2017; and by-right approvals of market-rate development by state law in San Francisco would incentivize land speculation and speculative development entitlements in gentrifying communities of color, which is associated with racial and socioeconomic demographic shifts, evictions, displacement, further regional segregation, and exacerbated racial disparities.

Presently there's a surplus of vacant high-end and market rate units in our city.

Please vote for this resolution. Thank You. Sincerely,

Anastasia Yovanopoulos District #8 tenant

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Support for Supervisor Mar"s Resolution Item 29, File 200955

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:03:00 PM

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 2:49 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Support for Supervisor Mar's Resolution Item 29, File 200955

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

Hi to all the Supervisors!

It is time to actually support the longest running BOS promise to build more affordable housing! No more trickle down thinking that market rate housing will somehow now increase the number of affordable units. Stand up for Supervisor Mar's resolution to do the right thing, and STOP the games the developers and their political allies are playing that sabotage getting homes for regular folks built.

DO IT ON AUGUST 25, 2020!

Thanks, Nancy Wuerfel

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Adopt Supervisor Mar"s Resolution Item 29, File 200955

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:04:00 PM

From: Steve Ward <seaward94133@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 3:24 PM

To: Steve Ward <seaward94133@yahoo.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston,
Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt
(BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton,
Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;
Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman
(BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Adopt Supervisor Mar's Resolution Item 29, File 200955

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

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Adopt Supervisor Mar's Resolution Item 29, File 200955. RHNA quotas should at minimum should reflect the burden already undertaken by San Francisco as his proposal argues. Furthermore due consideration should be given to the density of the area on which RHNA is imposing that burden. Fairness would require that those having a higher density need bare less a burden than that of those areas with low density. Economic development as a precursor or simultaneous catalyst must figure strongly in planning for those areas that have the room, desire and the need for development.

Areas devastated by fire might be explored.

COVID-19 presents new dynamics for housing, malls emptied as well as many other store fronts which can be converted. The office vacancy rate 13% in SF as people will be working at home as an increasing and continuing trend presents an opportunity for conversion. Public transportation is down 75%. Increased density results in increased contagion opportunity The trend is that people are exiting San Francisco.

The people who live in the area where the development will come to rest should have the greatest say and have the most knowledge of what is appropriate to the character, needs, infrastructure and general well being of their unique neighborhood. Their local political leaders must have the authority to make those calls and are the ones most easily accessible and accountable to the local people. Supervisor Mar's resolution is a step in the direction of preserving this principle and of achieving the fairness herein advocated.

Steve Ward La Playa Park Village Outer Sunset Distr. SF From: <u>Kathy Howard</u>

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Haney, Matt

(BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ronen,

Hillary; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS)

 Subject:
 BOS Item 29, 200955 - SUPPORT

 Date:
 Monday, August 24, 2020 5:32:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing in support of Resolution Item 29, File 200955.

I oppose any increase in the ABAG RHNA quotas for market-rate housing. I mean, really. How many more neighborhoods does we have to destroy to satisfy the greed of developers?

But if you need other reasons to limit market-rate housing quotas, here are a few:

- There are only so many building sites in San Francisco. Building market-rate housing uses up land and resources that should be used for lower-income housing.
- There are now many vacant housing units; we need to find them and get them on the market.
- Air BnB still has a lot of units in SF that are not registered. We need to find them and get them on the market.
- With more fires and loss of homes all over the state, the price of building material and the shortage of labor is going to increase even more than during the last fires. Affordable housing cannot compete with market-rate housing in paying for materials and labor. It will all go to more luxury developments, if they are permitted.
- Every 10 units of market-rate housing requires at least 3 units of affordable housing for the people who provide services to the upper classes. If we build more market-rate units, we will just need more and more affordable units. This is a Catch-22. We can't build market rate housing as a way out of the affordability crises.
- The COVID pandemic (and the one after that, whenever it happens) has destroyed many of the small businesses that made San Francisco unique and attracted high earners.
- The COVID pandemic and the desire for social distancing, as well as the need for open space and backyards for families, have prompted those who can afford it to move to areas with these amenities. The much-praised-by-development-interests-stack-and-pack housing has lost its appeal while destroying those very amenities of open and green space that might have persuaded people to stay in the City.
- The loss of many of the jobs that made the city attractive to wealthy tech workers, and the discovery that people can work at home (or even attend City hall meetings from the comfort of our dining rooms), have all prompted people to rethink paying high rents or mortgages to live in San Francisco.
- The people who do not have the above options and cannot afford to move are people whom we need in San Francisco, to keep it the diverse and vibrant city it has bgeen. We need to provide housing for them first.

We don't need more market-rate housing. Our RHNA quotas for market-rate housing should be

DECREASED or even eliminated.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Howard

From: Adam Buchbinder

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Item 29 on the Tuesday, August 25 BoS meeting (File No. 200955).

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 10:55:45 PM

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

Hello! I'm not from San Francisco; I'm a Planning Commissioner in the South Bay. We'll soon be revising our housing element, and I'm excited that we'll have RHNA numbers which will more accurately reflect the need in the region.

Unfortunately, Supervisor Mar seems to have a different attitude. To see a member of the Board of Supervisors making an attempt to bar entry to the city *while it's the only part of the region not on fire or clogged with smoke* is cruel and short-sighted.

Mar's resolution claims that "San Francisco has shouldered much of the region's housing development, far above its regional share of households"; in fact, it's added only one home for every eight to ten new jobs in the city!

(https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2019/09/20/our-viewtheres-only-one-way-to-fix-our-housing.html) If construction since 2010 had tripled, San Francisco would still be consigning its workers to homelessness or crushing commutes.

Mar claims that "There is little basis for "unmet market-rate housing need" in San Francisco's rates of housing cost burden and overcrowding", but the *reason* the market serves so few people in San Francisco is precisely because of the kind of supply restrictions Mar is proposing. Low-quality housing is stupendously expensive precisely because the city has chased this fantasy, that new buildings displace people, when in fact, a *lack* of new buildings displaces people (https://research.upjohn.org/up_workingpapers/307/).

Mar's resolution includes fearmongering about "SB35 by-right approvals for market-rate housing [...] it would further incentivize land speculation, associated with displacement and regional segregation". SB 35 only applies to projects which are 50% or more subsidized affordable housing, according to San Francisco's own planning department (https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/forms/SB35_SupplementalApplication.pdf). The Starcity development at 457-475 Minna contains 143 subsidized units; Mercy Housing has 145 permanent supportive units at 833 Bryant; Episcopal Community Services is providing 256 supportive units for formerly homeless people at 1068 Mission. *All* of these were fast-tracked using SB 35. (https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/11/24/is-californias-most-controversial-new-housing-production-law-working/)

The President of ABAG, Mayor Jesse Arreguin of Berkeley, assured the public that RHNA goals are "a floor, not a ceiling"

(https://twitter.com/aceckhouse/status/1276284168041689089) when the regional allocation was set. The Board of Supervisors could, if they desired, plan to *solve* the housing crisis--while the 6th Cycle numbers are better than the 5th, a shortage will remain even if those numbers are met (https://medium.com/yimby/planning-to-fail-4e832012a020). I urge the Board to reject Supervisor Mar's resolution, and allocate for plentiful housing in San

Francisco.

Adam Buchbinder

From: marla bastien knight

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Market Rate Housing Quota

Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 10:51:18 AM

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

Dear Board Members and President Yee,

I urge you to suupport Supervisor Mar's resolution. We are in the middle of a pandemic and economic downturn that is unprecedented and undoubtedly long term. Build more market rate housing? For the wealthy who are left standing and probably will only live in these units parttime? This is folly. We need to build housing for those who actually need it. We need to responsibly plan for a future SF that supports a strong middle class, the bedrock of any viable society. We need more affordable housing not more market rate!

Respectfully yours, Marla Bastien Knight From: <u>larrydelaney1@aol.com</u>

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Haney, Matt

(BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ronen,

Hillary; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS)

Cc: <u>barbarabdelaney@gmail.com; kathyhoward@earthlink.net; Quan, Daisy (BOS)</u>

Subject: Supporting Gordon Mar"s resolution on affordable housing

Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 11:39:40 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

We strongly urge you to support the resolution on today's agenda written by Gordon Mar urging the Association of Bay Area Governments in its upcoming Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Process to focus on San Francisco's unmet needs for housing affordable to low- and moderate-income residents, and to maintain the current RHNA allocation level of above-moderate housing in San Francisco.

This resolution is very well written and articulates the compelling reasons why it should be approved.

Warm regards,

Larry and Barbara Delaney 1279 44th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Support Resolution Item 29, File 200955

Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 8:59:00 AM

From: jrigo.sf@gmail.com <jrigo.sf@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 8:12 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Support Resolution Item 29, File 200955

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Resolution Item 29, File 200955.

We need to ensure our housing goals reflect the needs of our residents, and in San Francisco, that means prioritizing housing that's actually affordable to the people who live here. The increase in our RHNA goals is more dangerous than any of the housing bills that are circulating in Sacramento. Why? Because most likely, San Francisco will NOT meet our RHNA quota, in which case, Scott Wiener's SB 35 will force ALL market rate developments to be approved by-right with NO public input as long as they offer a measly 10% affordable housing.

Thank you,

Jeff Rigo

San Francisco

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS)

Subject: FW: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #29 Urging ABAG in RHNA to Focus on Unmet Needs for Affordable

Housing File #200955

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 11:03:11 PM

Hello all,

For the file.

Eileen

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 12:43 PM

To: BOS-Supervisors

bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides

bos-

legislative_aides@sfgov.org>

Subject: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #29 Urging ABAG in RHNA to Focus on Unmet Needs for

Affordable Housing File #200955

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am supporting this resolution as there are a number of issues with the current RHNA numbers and process.

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Adopt Supervisor Mar"s Resolution Item 29, File 200955

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:04:31 PM

From: Steve Ward <seaward94133@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 3:24 PM

To: Steve Ward <seaward94133@yahoo.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston,
Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt
(BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton,
Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;
Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman
(BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Adopt Supervisor Mar's Resolution Item 29, File 200955

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

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Adopt Supervisor Mar's Resolution Item 29, File 200955. RHNA quotas should at minimum should reflect the burden already undertaken by San Francisco as his proposal argues. Furthermore due consideration should be given to the density of the area on which RHNA is imposing that burden. Fairness would require that those having a higher density need bare less a burden than that of those areas with low density. Economic development as a precursor or simultaneous catalyst must figure strongly in planning for those areas that have the room, desire and the need for development.

Areas devastated by fire might be explored.

COVID-19 presents new dynamics for housing, malls emptied as well as many other store fronts which can be converted. The office vacancy rate 13% in SF as people will be working at home as an increasing and continuing trend presents an opportunity for conversion. Public transportation is down 75%. Increased density results in increased contagion opportunity The trend is that people are exiting San Francisco.

The people who live in the area where the development will come to rest should have the greatest say and have the most knowledge of what is appropriate to the character, needs, infrastructure and general well being of their unique neighborhood. Their local political leaders must have the authority to make those calls and are the ones most easily accessible and accountable to the local people. Supervisor Mar's resolution is a step in the direction of preserving this principle and of achieving the fairness herein advocated.

Steve Ward La Playa Park Village Outer Sunset Distr. SF

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Support for Supervisor Mar"s Resolution Item 29, File 200955

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:03:09 PM

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 2:49 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Support for Supervisor Mar's Resolution Item 29, File 200955

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

Hi to all the Supervisors!

It is time to actually support the longest running BOS promise to build more affordable housing! No more trickle down thinking that market rate housing will somehow now increase the number of affordable units. Stand up for Supervisor Mar's resolution to do the right thing, and STOP the games the developers and their political allies are playing that sabotage getting homes for regular folks built.

DO IT ON AUGUST 25, 2020!

Thanks, Nancy Wuerfel