

From: [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Subject: OPPOSE CEQA Legislation - BOS File 201284
Date: Friday, May 14, 2021 11:38:25 AM

From: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Subject: OPPOSE CEQA Legislation - BOS File 201284

From: Marlayne Morgan <marlayne16@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 3:19:28 PM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Subject: OPPOSE CEQA Legislation - BOS File 201284

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

May 13, 2021

Dear President Melgar and Supervisors:

Please oppose the amendments to the CEQA appeals process in San Francisco. Allowing a city department to proceed without a rigorous environmental review may lead to long lasting environmental damage. This legislation will affect thousands of acres of San Francisco City owned properties - our parks, streets, the Port properties, the airport, and SFPUC lands - all will be put at risk. Once this precedent has been set, it may be used to argue for extending the same practice to private projects.

This legislation also raises barriers to the public's participation in environmental review by requiring 50 signatures for certain types of public projects. Forcing residents to find 50 neighbors to sign a CEQA appeal is burdensome to all San Franciscans. Underserved communities already face many day-to-day challenges; this will add to their difficulty in protecting their neighborhoods through an accessible CEQA process.

Over the last five years, CEQA appeals in San Francisco comprised only .5% (or ½ of 1%) of all the categorical exemptions. This is not an onerous burden for City government. In addition, no figures have been provided that show this is a financial burden for a City budget of billions of dollars. In fact, the impact of environmentally-damaging projects can be much more costly in the long run, both in terms of remediation and, even more importantly, impacts on human and environmental health.

No one can predict the kinds of projects that will be proposed in the future. Even one bad project can do severe environmental damage. The best way to protect the City and its residents from environmentally damaging projects is to maintain a consistent and rigorous CEQA process accessible to all San Franciscans. To do this, the Board of Supervisors should reject this legislation.

Best regards,

/s/

Marlayne Morgan, President

Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association

