



43rd Annual Anniversary
HOLIDAY DINNER

Presidents Message

Happy Holiday to one and all. Welcome to 2016.

The December 15th, 2015, CSFN Anniversary Dinner was a great success. The United Irish Cultural Center provided unique and delicious meals and no one went away hungry. The lamb shank in particular was robust.

Many thanks to the CSFN Dinner Committee: Kathy Lentz, Glenn Rogers, David Pilpel and Marlayne Morgan. I enjoyed participating as well. Marlayne chaired the Dinner Committee and did a great job organizing the annual event. She worked tirelessly on the Anniversary Dinner and was in large part responsible for the Dinner's success.

It was my pleasure to be the master of ceremonies. Members of our current board were introduced i.e. Barbara Graham, Greg Scott, Glenn Rogers, Lorraine Lucas, Marlayne Morgan and Penelope Clark. Unfortunately, Charles Head had a prior commitment.

Neighbors mingled with members of BART, Recology, SEIU Local 1021, the SFPUC, SF Tomorrow, local lobbyists, Sutro Tower, Planning Commission members, neighborhood activists and local politicians at perhaps one of the longest bars in the City.

California State Senator, Mark Leno, CSFN's featured speaker, was introduced by Marlayne Morgan. He spoke about California state legislation and its impacts on City and County policies and government. The message was very well received and he fielded our questions.

I introduced Aaron Peskin, the newly appointed District 3 Supervisor. Many in the crowd relished his victory over Mayor Lee appointee, Julie Christensen. Supervisor Peskin's victory gave City progressives a six to five majority on the Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Peskin talked briefly about how happy he is to be back in office and that one of his primary objectives will be the proper building of affordable housing.

Supervisor Peskin and Supervisor Jane Kim—who was also in attendance—had just finished voting down a contentious proposal to replace the 850 Bryant Street jail, which failed unanimously that afternoon. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors refused to allocate \$215 million for the project and said the city should invest instead in diversion programs and mental health services.

The jail, which was heavily backed by Mayor Lee was only 51% full and was so empty that the City was taking in prisoners from other counties to help pay for the aging structure's maintenance.

Mari Eliza from EMIA then introduced CSFN's top honoree, Andy Blue. Mr. Blue helped form the Plaza 16 Coalition, an aggregation of community, labor, environmental, and faith-based organizations along with neighborhood residents and local businesses from the Mission District and across the city. The Coalition was formed in 2013 to challenge the "Monster in the Mission" proposed for the 16th and Mission BART Plaza, an extreme example of luxury and market rate development that has contributed significantly to the displacement crisis in the Mission. The 16th and Mission project would have been the largest market rate development in Mission District history.

CSFN's member honoree was Avrum Shepard, who unfortunately was out of town and received his award in absentia. Avrum has helped create and oversee virtually all of CSFN's website and website postings over the last ten years. His knowledge, patience and help have been invaluable to CSFN. Many thanks to Avrum for his help.

I want to thank everyone for attending and making CSFN's 43rd Annual Anniversary Dinner such a wonderful event.

Draft Minutes for the General Assembly Meeting

November 15, 2015

1. Call to Order. President George Wooding brought the meeting to order at 7:05PM in the Northern Police Station Community Room. Charles Head (SHARP) called for a moment of silence in solidarity with the people and neighborhoods of Paris.
 - a. Quorum declared. 22 delegates and alternates represented 19 CSFN member organizations. Three guests signed in.
 - b. Agenda approved.
 - c. Introductions. Delegates and guests introduced themselves. Hosts: TPC&OSC was not able to send a representative, so Glenn Rogers (PMAC) read delegate Ramona Albright's words on promoting responsible density and open space. Lars Smith (UTA) said his group is between the two USF campuses but that town-gown relations have been getting better over the last ten years.
2. Officers' Reports.
 - a. President Wooding (MTHA) Rose Hillson's resignation from the office of 2nd VP means we need people to apply. A Transit Fee is now in force for residential properties of 20 units or more as well as commercial properties. Aaron Peskin won the D3 race.
 - b. First VP Morgan (CHNA) Absent
 - c. Second VP Vacant
 - d. Recording Secretary Head (SHARP) and President Wooding went to the Nov. 12 ad hoc strategy meeting at the Hall of Flowers on AHBP, the Planning Commission hearing on Nov. 5, and the By-Laws meeting on Oct. 28.
 - e. Corresponding Secretary Rogers (PMAC) testified before the Board of Appeals about Parkmerced and attended the same planning meeting previously mentioned.
 - f. Treasurer Scott (PHRA) is working on getting Directors and Officers insurance. Otherwise little activity in October.
3. Committee Action Items
 - a. Executive – in NL. Charles Head requested a change in the ExCom report.
 - b. Bylaws – Chair Claire Zvanski (EDIA) sent a report that did not get in the NL. Discussion now centers on by-laws vs. policies and procedures.
 - c. Dinner – The Irish Cultural Center is the venue, the menu is set and Sen. Leno will be the keynote speaker.
 - d. Government & Elections. Chair Charles Head (SHARP) reported that monthly meetings would begin in January.
 - e. Land Use – Paul Webber called the delegate's attention to the fine explanation of AHDP on the front page of the NL. The author, Barbara Graham (PHRA) was identified and lauded. Paul said a letter would be sent to Planning staff from our ad hoc group before the Dec. 3 meeting.
 - f. Media Relations. Chair Eileen Boken (SPEAK) – no report
 - g. Open Space. Nancy Wuerfel and Kathy Howard (SPEAK) – Kathy Howard spoke about the Ortega Library meeting video and the Palace of Arts controversy.
 - h. Transportation. Chair Mari Eliza (EMIA) spoke of changes coming re: BRT and there was discussion of trees and traffic on Van Ness.
 - i. Water Task Force. Chair Joan Girardot (MCI&POA) No report
4. Approval of the Oct. 20 2015 GA minutes – they were approved unanimously.

5. Unfinished Business – Mari Eliza (EMIA) read the resolution on Private Commuter shuttle buses printed in last month's NL which passed 11-4-4.

6. New Business – A request was made to list the next few hosting assignments and records of votes taken (like a slate card for ballot measures) should be printed in the Newsletter.

7. Program: Samsun Wong from BART spoke about senior field trips for neighborhood associations and Clipper Card information . Political analyst Chris Bowman gave the 2015 election roundup. Both answered questions from the delegates.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 9:31.

... Charles Head (SHARP) Recording Secretary

Executive Committee Report 12/2/2015

The November ExCom was held on December 2, due to the conflict with the Thanksgiving Holiday. The meeting was called to order at 5:40 pm by Chair Marlayne Morgan. A Quorum was established, with all present except for Treasurer Scott, Excused.

President Wooding and Member at Large Member Graham gave an update on the work of the AHBP task force as they prepare for the January 28 hearing at the Planning Commission. Special mention was made of the value of the foundation laid by Rose Hillson in her research and analysis of the proposed legislation.

Chair Morgan raised concerns about the lack of support for the Holiday Dinner from CSFN member organizations, considering that the Dinner was only ten days away. ExCom members volunteered to contact organizations and previous sponsors that had not yet responded to the invitations to ensure that we could meet our minimum guarantee for the Irish Cultural Center.

The program for January 2016 will focus on the Affordable Housing Bonus Program (AHBP) legislation and the upcoming hearing.

Under Unfinished Business, the Committee reviewed the current Membership Form which will be distributed in the January Newsletter and at the January GA. The Recording Secretary will remind member organizations to complete all areas of the form accurately.

A request was made at the November GA to list a hosting preview.

February: Haight Ashbury Improvement Association (HAIA) and Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Assoc. (MCIPOA)

March: Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) and Inner Sunset Action Committee (ISAC)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Marlayne Morgan, Chair

Bylaws Committee Report 10/15/15

The Bylaws Committee has decided to review three sections of the bylaws over the next three months: Membership, Elections and Quorum. The discussion began with the Membership section. No specific decisions or recommendations were made and review will continue at the next meeting.

The Committee had a preliminary discussion regarding process. It was clarified that bylaws are the governing rules of the organization and other things such as policies, procedures and codes of conduct are part of process and are never included in bylaws. They are administrative guidelines that allow the officers, delegates and organization to function as directed by the mission statement and bylaws. Procedurally, the policies and procedures, as well as a code of conduct,

must be approved by the general assembly, as the CSFN is a delegated organization.

The next meeting will be Friday, December 4, 6-8:30pm at Little Joe's Pizzeria, 5006 Mission (at Italy).

12/04/15

The Bylaws Committee met to continue its review of specific by-laws sections. It was decided to recommend two bylaws amendments for consideration by the delegate assembly. The committee is writing the amendments and must review them before they are submitted.

The Committee will also review recommendations from the March, 2015 meeting. At least one numbering error was discovered. The full bylaws will be reviewed to make certain all numbering is correct and that previous amendments were properly incorporated. Such corrections will also be presented for approval by the delegate assembly when they are complete.

Amendments will be noticed properly according to bylaws section XI. Amendments to these bylaws.

No January meeting date was set.

Claire Zvanski, Chair

Government and Elections Committee

The G&E Committee will meet January 15, the second Friday of the month, from 6 - 8 pm at Taraval Police Station to discuss upcoming local and state ballot measures.

Charles Head, Chair

Land Use and Transportation Committee

Land Use and Transportation Committee will meet Monday, January 25 (4th Monday) at the Northern Police Station 5 -7:30 pm.

All CSFN Members should prioritize attending the meeting in your District and any other District. A number of the Supervisors have now come out against the proposed legislation. Make sure the Mayor's Office and Supervisors hear from your neighborhood!

UPCOMING AHBP MEETINGS

Community Meeting - District 2

Wednesday, January 6, 6:00-8:00PM

Calvary Presbyterian Church, 2515 Fillmore Street

Community Meeting - District 7

Tuesday, January 12, 6:00-8:00PM

SF County Fair Building, 1199 9th Avenue

Community Meeting - District 3

Thursday, January 14, 2016 - 6:00-8:00PM

Saint Paulus Lutheran Church, 1541 Polk Street

The Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC) Panel on the AHDP

Thursday, 14 Jan at 7 PM

Park Branch Library, 1833 Page Street.

Community Meeting - District 1

Saturday, January 23, 1:00-3:00PM

Richmond Recreation Center, 251 18th Avenue

**SENT FROM GEORGE WOODING, CSFN PRESIDENT
TO RODNEY FONG, PRESIDENT SF PLANNING COMMISSION**

This email is to further explain the principles behind the CSFN Resolution dated Oct. 20, 2015, and to receive answers from the Planning Staff and the MOHCD regarding the many questions we have posed in Attachment A. As more AHBP public outreach informational meetings are held by Staff in all of the Supervisorial Districts over the next 6-8 weeks, even more questions and concerns will need to be addressed to gain broader support and ensure success for this very important and far reaching citywide program.

Since Staff will need more time to respond and fully expand the proposed program into a more robust affordable housing solution for San Franciscans, we highly recommend and urge the Planning Commission to direct Staff to **put on indefinite hold** the proposed AHBP Ordinance (2014- 001503PCA, Board File 150969), as well as any related legislation which has a nexus to AHBP, including but not limited to 2015-012718PCA (Board File No. 150914) Item 9 on the Planning Commission's December 3, 2015 Agenda.

In the interim, the City can continue to comply with the State Density Bonus Law requirements (California Code Section 63915) and by creating Special Use Districts with conditional use permits, until a more comprehensive City program is developed in concert with the neighborhoods and community.

This letter is divided into the following sections: Part I. Comments and Suggestions;

Part II. Where Do We Go From Here; a Proposed New Beginning; and Attachment A. CSFN Questions for the Planning Department and Attachment B. CSFN AHBP Resolution, October 20, 2015

Part I. Comments and Suggestions

There has been no neighborhood involvement and consideration.

It is fair to say that the philosophy of the program, as proposed, was developed with limited to no participation by affected neighborhoods throughout the City and their constituency groups. The Mayor, City staff and two consultants have been working on the AHBP program for well over a year, and now a much shorter period has been proposed for community "outreach" and public input. This is inadequate and disrespectful of the neighborhoods and their residents.

Negative impacts on RH-1 & RH-2 areas although apparently excluded under AHBP.

The Staff memo dated November 5, 2015, again offers assurances that RH-1 & RH-2 areas are excluded from the AHBP program but that doesn't mean much if the next door neighbor or the

building across the street is zoned for RH-2. We now know that RH-2 parcels can be used for affordable housing projects that can include numerous micro units or single resident occupancy (SRO) units or be a group home. It isn't AHBP that allows this but other related legislation does. In this case, it is the Article 2 Code Consolidation that was passed in May 2015. The bottom line is that the builder is still entitled to the concessions and waivers offered under AHBP if there are units designated as affordable rentals or condominiums. Concessions like greater building bulk, height increases of 2-3 stories, building to the property line, 75% or more reduction in on site parking, less open space do add up to increase profitability for the builder but it's at the expense of the neighbors, impacting neighborhood character, quality of life, more competition for street parking for the residents.

Proposed "one size fits all" program completely disregards neighborhood uniqueness. As a consequence of the work primarily of two outside consultants and no input from the neighborhoods, the proposed program accommodates density increases by a uniform set of development waivers relating to height, density, open space, parking requirements and the like for San Franciscans, i.e., "one size fits all." There is no consideration of the unique character of neighborhoods, or their resultant and unique neighborhood land use and zoning, designed to address neighborhood-specific issues. These are not uniform across neighborhoods. Similarly, the Staff is proposing new AHBP Design Guidelines that also don't take neighborhood differences into account. In an effort to force all of San Francisco into one set of rules, the program mandates a policy of neighborhood uniformity. It is important to preserve and accommodate the uniqueness of our neighborhoods. This is what has made San Francisco, the iconic and desirable place that it is. However, the proposed AHBP program promotes Orange County like blandness and sameness, which is NOT what has made the San Francisco great.

Too much discretion delegated to Staff with inadequate review processes and review by the Planning Commission.

Under the proposed administrative priority processing policies and procedures that are purported to expedite project approval time for developers, all current conditional use requirements and reviews under Section 309 and Section 329 are eliminated. In addition, critical findings, judgments and negotiations with developers are relegated to a staff person internal to the Planning Department, away from the eyes of the public and the Planning Commission.

Moreover, with the public's right to advance notification and their right to appeal and Planning Commission review and oversight all eliminated, the proposed internal administrative priority process is ripe for favoritism and manipulation. Transparency for the public is sacrificed for expediency for the developer.

Minimum square footage for different types of units must be specified.

The AHBP Ordinance does not mandate minimum square footages within unit envelopes for each below market unit type within a building, but it must, just as unit mixes are mandated, i.e., studio: XX sq ft; 1 bedroom: YY sq ft; 2 bedroom: ZZ sq ft.

Protection for rent controlled housing stock.

Historically, rent controlled housing has been a critical source of low and moderate income housing in San Francisco. Unfortunately, the stock has been dwindling and needs to be maintained.

Regrettably, three of the four AHBP programs as well as the State Density Bonus Law clearly allow the destruction and replacement of rent controlled housing. What is the purpose of tearing rent controlled units out and replacing them one for one with; this does nothing to increase the total number of affordable units available We urge you to revise the proposed AHBP Ordinance program to specifically prohibit demolishing buildings in which rent controlled units exist or had existed within the five years preceding filing a bonus application.

In a similar vein, since mixed use projects can be created to ensure profitability, there should also be some equivalent protection against the loss of local small businesses, of which there is none now in the legislation.

Program doesn't meet Prop K voter approved policy goals.

Staff has repeatedly used Prop K as justification for extending affordable housing to include middle income persons who can have

incomes as high as 140 of AMI under the proposed Local AHBP. In pushing this, Staff purports to rely heavily on Proposition K, implying that it states a goal of 50% middle income housing in new construction. In the Staff Memo to the Commission on November 5, 2015, it describes Prop K as a Policy of the City to build or rehab 30,000 new and rehabilitated homes throughout the City, of which at least one third would be low and moderate income units and "half within the reach of middle class San Franciscans." On p.3, there is a similar goal, referring to "working middle class San Franciscans." In other words, Prop K actually means that of the total new units to be built, 50%, in the aggregate, are for "Working households" of which, one component of 33% is for low and moderate, and the other component of 17% is for middle income. Moreover, it should be noted that the State Law does not include middle income housing as being eligible for bonuses. It is unclear what policy is being served by the big push for middle income housing over low and moderate when its Prop K is ABOUT HALF of the Prop K goal of low and moderate? Greater support is needed for very low, low and moderate income.

Eliminate "vertical additions" from the AHBP programs.

The Staff currently states that there will not be "vertical additions" to existing buildings, meaning that the program for now is limited only to new construction from the ground up. Vertical additions should be specifically prohibited under AHBP until studies of the problems related to vertical additions are completed.

Infrastructure inadequate for this massive AHBP undertaking.

Inadequate attention has been paid to the community infrastructure that must accompany a massive upzoning of the scale proposed for the AHBP project. While the City assumes growth will happen along transportation corridors, there is no assurance that the developers won't put down foundations wherever the demand is and where they can find the cheapest land.

Moreover, transportation is but one part of the needed infrastructure. Equally important is school capacity (the program is to attract families), police and fire facilities, equipment and personnel, sewer and water facilities, especially in light of current and, most likely continuing conservation

mandates and the need for increased street parking, which is dwindling. A coordinated, comprehensive City plan is a required pre-requisite for the proposed AHBP program.

Developer financial feasibility analysis needs to be redone.

The City's outside financial consultant made a faulty assumption that there would be no increase

in the cost of land in conducting the developer financial feasibility analysis. We recommend that this analysis be redone based on alternative yearly increases of 2.5%, 5% and 10% to test the validity of the financial feasibility conclusions.

PART II. A Proposed New Beginning; Where Do We Go From Here?

As the residents of the City are now becoming increasingly aware of the magnitude and consequences of the proposed density programs, there has been rolling fear and anger spreading across the City. We hear about it almost daily.

The anger is rising because the neighborhoods and constituency representative groups were not invited to the table as "partners" in the process and their neighborhoods will be homogenized. By implementing the proposed AHBP Design Guidelines citywide, it will create a uniform and bland makeover of our highly unique neighborhoods.

Fear is also rising among long time residents, many, if not most of whom, are in the very income groups that need assistance under AHBP. There is great concern that they will be forced out of their homes to make room for new units, which they couldn't afford or will otherwise not be available to them with adequate rent protection. They worry about where could they live while the new units are under construction and whether they will be among those qualified who actually gets selected in the lottery to live in the new building,

Small business owners are also very fearful that in the name of accommodating middle class housing, they will be forced out of their long-standing neighborhood serving businesses as well as lose their customers base and livelihood.

In closing, we have identified the many issues that are the source of this increasing anger, fear and concern over "one size fits all" planning. Together with other constituency organizations, we stand ready to discuss our ideas further, but the proposed timetable is definitely unrealistic based on the nature, complexity and broad scope of the proposed AHBP program and related legislation.

For this reason, we again urge you to direct Staff to **put on indefinite hold** ALL pending legislation that is about or has a nexus to, the AHBP program and continue to comply with the State Bonus Density Law by creating Special Use Districts through conditional use permits until a more comprehensive City program can be developed in concert with the neighborhoods and community

Attachment A: CSFN Questions for Planning Staff 1. AHBP Program Design and Analysis Issues

A. The City selected 11 prototypical sites for modeling program design to facilitate increased density

What was the assumed number (not percentages) of units per building, broken down by very low, low, moderate and middle income and market rate units?

What was the assumed square footage devoted to each category of units per building and on what floors?

What were the gross and net square footage of the units per building (i.e., studio, one bedroom, two bedroom and three or larger bedrooms) and on what floors?

Did the modeling for the 11 prototyped sites take into account the Ellis Act or other displacement of tenants in rent controlled units, If so, as to come up with a net of additional (or fewer) persons/families in very low, low and moderate income units?

How many displaced small businesses were modeled in the 11 prototyped sites?

Please explain the reason(s) that there is no minimum square footages specified for each type of unit.

B. Seifel Consulting Inc, was the sole outside financial consultant used by Planning Staff. Their methodology only used three prototype sites to analyze financial feasibility from the developer perspective and only studied two NCD and one RC-4 sites. Only one of the prototypes included rental units, the other two were condominiums.

What is the data reliability of this small sample size for extrapolating to 30,000 potential sites throughout San Francisco?

How would the financial feasibility change if more rental units than condominium units were required based on the probability that most very low, low, moderate households could only afford to rent, wouldn't have enough money to make a down payment for condominium ownership nor be able to pay the condominium assessments and other fees.

The financial analysis was based on the assumption that there would be no increase in land costs related to the program. This does not appear to be realistic, especially along transit corridors. Please provide a financial analysis for projected build out, broken down by very low, low, moderate, middle income and market rate units with adjustments for yearly land cost increases of 2.5%, 5% and 10%.

In Seifel's "Summary of Fixed Development Assumptions by Prototype" document describes workable AHBP unit sizes from low of 200 to a high of 600 sq. ft. What would be real life examples with units in this size range for the 240 soft sites as the rest of the City? How will unit of this size range attract FAMILIES?

According to Seifel's financial feasibility analysis, significantly more "market-rate" units will be need to be generated under AHBP than "affordable" units. One analysis included the as much as 50 market-rate units to 7 affordable. Why is this AHBP being called the "Affordable" program when it has more to do with a "MARKET-RATE Housing Bonus Program"?

Please provide the economic feasibility analysis for any RH and RM parcels identified as soft sites based on:

Prototypes used in the original analysis by Seifel and David Baker-Associates.

Real-life examples of potential buildings/lots (240 "soft sites") since the Seifel analysis does not appear to have this information.

Since Planning Commissioners asked for "real life" examples with existing buildings on the lots studied. Please provide the real examples in each of the various neighborhoods.

Please explain the rationale why incentives and concessions in the proposed Local AHBP

Program are "all or nothing" rather than graduating incrementally from a minimum percentage over a baseline up to, say, 135% as is done under the State Density Bonus Law?

In the Staff Memo on the State Program Analyzed, Table 206.5A on p20 makes no mention of Common Interest Developments, which under State Law is the only type of project eligible

for moderate income density bonus, but does mention that in the incentive and concessions table (Table 206.5B on p 22.) Why the difference?

According to Planning Staff, the City has been complying with the State Density Bonus Law through Special Use Districts (SUD) for on-site building of inclusionary units. Please provide the following information for each of the on-site inclusionary projects implemented in the City from 2010 to 2015:

How many units were built on-site, both in actual number for each project and as a percentage of the total units?

Please detail what process or procedures were followed in negotiating with developers who requested incentives and waivers under the State Density Bonus Law?

For each project, list the type of density bonus concessions, incentives provided and development standards waived.

Explain the decision making process, the standards applied in granting or rejecting bonus requests and name of program(s), if any, under which these were granted.

Infrastructure Issues

The Staff Memo, the 2014 Housing Element Affordable Housing Goals are state, one of which (No. 1) is to "Ensure new housing is sustainably supported by the City's

public infrastructure systems."

What specific infrastructure upgrades/expansions are being anticipated to accommodate the maximum number of AHBP units (approximately 16,000 units) to be built. At a minimum, these infrastructure increases should include:

Public transportation and roads

Schools for new families

First responder facilities, equipment and personnel

Sewage treatment and water sources/facilities (especially in light of the recent drought rules which will likely continue).

On-street parking for vehicles for units which will not have sufficient on-site parking as a result of concessions, incentives and design waivers.

What projections or budgeting has the City or any Department(s) done to prepare for and finance the increased infrastructure requirements.

How much of that infrastructure, in dollars and description is funded or in place, and how much is not?

What is the impact of the Transportation Sustainability Fee exceptions for affordable housing developers?

What assurance can there be that the new density bonus projects will be limited to building along transportation corridors?

Impacts on RH-1 & RH-2

Although the AHBP specifically excludes RH-1 & RH-2 parcels and the existing Area Plans, the proposed Amendments to the General Plan (2014-001503GPA) permit heights that are "several stories higher". It is not clear how many is "several." If a one story building is torn down and replaced, can the new building surpass the existing zoned height limit, and if so, by how many stories?

Per the Article 2 use tables, "group housing" is allowed in RH-2+ so won't the RH-1's surrounding the RH-2s be affected as well?

Since the new Article 2 adds micro/SRO units (new use allowed per Article 2), will the then allowance of 2-3 levels (or more) be used regardless of any Residential Design Guidelines to affect the adjacent and subsequent RH-1/RH-2 parcels?

AHBP Design Guidelines

For each of the three proposed AHBP programs (State Density Law, Analyzed State, Local) please show how buildings, located in the AHBP targeted zones (RM-1, RM-2, RH-3,) that are designed with the maximum waivers and incentives allowed under each program, will look when they are built next to RH-1 & RH-2 parcels?

Will the current Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) be eliminated once the AHBP Design Guidelines (DG) are adopted?

The current RDGs factor in characteristics of buildings adjacent and across the street and within particular nearest neighborhood commercial corridors. Will the AHBP DG mirror those? If so, explain what impact this will have on the lower density RH-1 & RH-2 zoned parcels?

AHBP Procedures Manual Amendments

Please describe the proposed amendments to the *Procedures Manual* authorized in Section 415 for each of the AHBP Policies and Procedures listed below:

Negotiations with Developers for Incentives and waiver concessions

Administrative Priority Processing oversight and monitoring policies and procedures

Identifying Planning Commission review and approval
Monitoring and enforcement of tenant financial eligibility status changes.

Monitoring and enforcement for replacement of rent controlled units.

Monitoring and enforcement for resale of ownership units.

Entitlement Eligibility & Loopholes

If salaries for teachers, police and fire personnel qualify them for affordable housing under this AHBP, how does one weed out teachers, or any other persons, who have the economic means in a blind trust or LLC or other arrangement to hide their economic "wealth"?

Do they sign an affidavit attesting that they do not have other real estate holdings nor would they otherwise have any economic means to be able to purchase in SF?

What are the loopholes to be closed?

If teachers' salaries are the basis for determining their eligibility for the Local middle income program, why not other people of different professions with the same salaries? Why just teachers?

If person or family income qualifies them for an affordable rental unit and after they have lived in the unit their income increases, are they required to report the change and move out of the unit?

Can the developer play "round robin" with the units by determining which ones are "affordable" and later designate another unit as part of the AHBP units?

Are there restrictions on the "market rate" units that will be built under the AHBP that they cannot be sold beyond a particular price like the lower income "affordable" housing has restrictions?

Who sets the rents and can they be changed annually since the AMIs will change?

Could a developer applicant "double dip" receive Prop A bond money and density bonus incentives and waivers

Related Legislation

On December 3, 2015, File No. 151083 (Planning Code – Affordable Housing in Public Zoning Districts) will be heard at the Planning Commission. This will affect neighborhoods especially in light of the upcoming AHBP legislation. Please explain how the 151083 Ordinance relates to and will impact the AHBP programs and visa versa.

How will the on-site unit density exception requirements under File No. 150348, 0155-15 – Planning Code – Inclusionary Housing Requirements for Group Housing, Affordable Designated Unit (ADU) Requirements in C-3 Districts, in conjunction with the units under AHBP proposed legislation's unit exemptions going to change the results of what is stated in the AHBP alone?

How does legislation in BOS File No. 150622 (Administrative, Planning Codes – Preferences in Affordable Housing Programs) affect the proposed AHBP legislation? How would AHBP affect it?

D. With the exceptions to units counting towards the density in 00030-15 (File No. 140954 – Planning Code – Exceptions from Dwelling Unit Density Limits and from Other Specified Code Requirements) passed at the BOS in March 2015, would not the density of additional units afforded by the proposed AHBP legislation make the building even more dense than what could be surmised as the total units under AHBP alone?



75 Howard Update

The SF Board of Appeals tied 2-2 on our appeal of the 75 Howard project. The tie will be settled at its January 27th meeting when we only need to pick up one vote.

Finally some city officials are showing they understand what SF is all about. One board members stated, "This is the most un-San Francisco building I have ever seen in my life." They were shocked that a modern glass box, with essentially no setbacks, could go in amongst all the historic, brick, low, and tapered buildings lining the Embarcadero.

We are asking all groups to send representatives to the 1/27 meeting at city hall (which begins at 5 PM) to express their concerns about the project as it is currently designed. More information, including our formal legal brief, is available from Dave Osgood at 75Howard@RinconNeighbors.com. Written comments can be submitted to the board up to Jan 21, but it is better to comment at the hearing.

This appeal is about the exceptions granted for extra height and bulk by the planning department. We have a second appeal, that will also be heard on the 27th, about variances. With your help we can succeed.

Submitted by Dave Osgood (RPNA)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Bylaws Chair Claire Zvanski, czvanski@hotmail.com. Ongoing Meetings.

Gov't & Elections Chair Charles Head. charleshead@hotmail.com. 6pm, second Friday, Taraval Police Station.

Land Use & Housing No Chair. 5 pm, 4th Monday. Northern Police Station

Open Space Chair Nancy Wuerfel, nancenumber1@aol.com, 731-6432, Co-chair Ramona Albright, 621-9621. Ongoing meetings.

Transportation Chair Mari Eliza, mari.eliza@sbcglobal.net 5 pm, 4th Monday, Northern Police Station.

Water Task Force • Chair Joan Girardot, csfnwatertaskforce@gmail.com, 346-5525. Ongoing meetings.

2016 General Assembly Dates

(Third Tuesday of the Month)
January 19
February 16
March 15
April 19
May 17
June 21
July 19
August 16
September 20
October 18
November 15
December- no meeting

Executive Committee Dates

(Fourth Wednesday of the Month)
January 27
February 24
March 23
April 27
May 25
June 29
July 27
August 24
September 28
October 26
November TBA
December- no meeting

ExComm—How to Reach Us:

President: George Wooding • gswooding@gmail.com • 695-1395
1st VP: Marlayne Morgan • marlayne16@gmail.com
Recording Secretary: Charles Head • charleshead@hotmail.com
Corresponding Secretary: Glenn Rogers • alderlandscape@comcast.net
Treasurer: Greg Scott • lgscpa@icloud.com
Member-at-Large: Penny Clark • penelopeclark@yahoo.com
Member-at-Large: Barbara Graham • barb.graham.sf@gmail.com
Member-at-Large: Lorraine Lucas • wozopozo@pacbell.net
Parliamentarian: vacant **Sergeant-At-Arms:** vacant

NEIGHBORHOOD VIEWS is published monthly, the official voice of the Coalition for SF Neighborhoods, Inc., a 501(c)4 organization.

To Submit Articles: Email articles by the 3rd (third) of the month to: Newsletter Editor (2nd VP) in Microsoft Word-compatible document (i.e. no pdf's) in-line or as attachment. Articles reflect the opinions of the submitter, not necessarily the opinion of the CSFN. We invite material from member organizations as well as rebuttal to articles already printed. We reserve the right to edit where necessary. Member organizations may receive two copies of the newsletter without charge. Subscription: Members/\$10, Non-members/\$15.

CORRECTIONS TO NEWSLETTER

Turn in written submissions to ExCom Chair (marlayne16@gmail.com)

3rd Annual Anniversary

HOLIDAY DINNER

BENEFACTORS

RECOLOGY
SF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
SUTRO TOWER/ FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

PATRONS

CATHEDRAL HILL NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
COLE VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
THE FX CROWLEY COMPANY
MIDTOWN TERRACE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
PARKMERCED ACTION COALITION
SF TOMORROW
SEIU LOCAL 1021
TELEGRAPH HILL DWELLERS
WEST OF TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL

SPONSORS

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
BART
BMW AND PARTNERS
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
JORDAN PARK IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
KATHRIN MOORE AND BILL ROBBERTSON
MIRALOMA PARK IMPROVEMENT CLUB
OMI NEIGHBORS IN ACTION
RICHMOND COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
SPEAK
UNIVERSITY TERRACE ASSOCIATION

WELCOME BACK TO THE BAY GUARDIAN!

It's been almost exactly a year since you last heard from us. But now the editors and publishers of the SF Bay Guardian are officially announcing that we are back!

2016 marks our 50th year as the Bay Area's number one alternative, progressive news source -- and we're ready to reboot by:

- *** Rescuing and preserving our archives in a public library and protective storage space
- *** Digitizing a half-century's worth of newspapers brimming with local politics, culture, and arts history, making them available for all
- *** Redesigning our website to bring you new content and allow you to search through five decades of Bay Guardian articles
- *** Relaunching key features like Best of the Bay, Clean Slate Endorsement Guide, GOLDIES Arts Awards, Nude Beaches Guide, opinion, editorials, indepth analysis, and more.

WANT TO HELP? GO TO:

www.indiegogo.com/projects/bring-back-the-bay-guardian--2#





Member Renewal

Mailing Address _____ SF 941 _____ Contact E-mail _____

Current Officers

Name	Office	Address (with ZIP)	Email Address	Phone

CSFN Delegate

Name	Address (with ZIP)	Email Address	Phone

If your organization has alternate CSFN delegates:

Name	Address (with ZIP)	Email Address	Phone

NEWSLETTER MAILING LIST – Each member is entitled to receive two copies of CSFN’s monthly newsletter Neighborhood Views as part of their membership fee. The first copy goes to the delegate and the second to a person designated by the organization. A member of an organization’s Board of Directors may subscribe to the CSFN newsletter at a rate of \$10 per year. Other persons may subscribe at \$15 per year. If you prefer to view the newsletter online or download it from the website www.csfm.net/newsletter check the box below and leave the following lines blank. Additional paid copies: use the back of this page. Include address and zip codes.

Email us the newsletter to following email address(es): _____

Do **not** send us a hard copy.

Send a hard copy to:

Name	Office	Address (with ZIP)	Phone

DUES, DONATIONS AND NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTIONS

CSFN Annual Membership dues are \$45. Organizations wishing to include an additional donation to CSFN are encouraged to do so. Please add \$10 for each additional newsletter subscription for your organization’s board members and \$15 for other members. Make check payable to CSFN and mail to CSFN POBox 320098 SF CA 94132.

Annual Membership Dues: \$45.	_____
Newsletter Subscriptions: @ \$10.	_____
Newsletter Subscriptions: @ \$15.	_____
Additional Donation	_____
Total to CSFN	_____
Thank You!	

CSFN Membership Certification

CSFN Bylaws (Article II, Section A-G) require each voting member organization to certify that it has a membership of 35 or more in order to maintain voting privileges. Organizations not having the required membership are encouraged to join or retain membership as associate members without voting privileges.

Member Organization (35 or more members) _____

Associate (non-voting) Member Organization _____

Certifying Signature _____

Address if not listed above _____



JANUARY 19, 2016 • CSFN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGENDA

6:30 I. Sign In and Refreshments

C. Dinner

7:00 II. Call to Order/ Ascertain Quorum

D. Government & Elections

E. Land Use & Housing

A. Introduction of Delegates and Guests /
Short Announcements

F. Media Relations

B. Hosts

G. Open Space

1. SPEAK

H. Transportation

2. Twin Peaks Improvement Association (TPIA)

I. Water Task Force

7:45 V. Approval of November 17, 2015
Minutes

7:15 III. Officers' Reports

8:00 VI. Unfinished Business

A. President

B. Vice Presidents

8:15 VII. New Business

C. Secretaries

D. Treasurer

8:30 VIII. Program

7:30 IV. Committee Action Items

—written reports in Newsletter

Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program

Kim/Peskin Legislation on Inclusionary Housing

(speakers TBA)

A. Executive

B. Bylaws

9:30 IX. Adjournment