“PUBLIC BENEFITS” Zoning
what it is and how it works

A Briefing to the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force
January ‘08
Is public benefits the same as developer fees....?  
   No

Is public benefits the same as affordable housing....?  
   No

Is public benefits the same as public infrastructure....?  
   No
Public Benefits refers to a range of needed community improvements that can be addressed through the land use planning and zoning process.

Planning process has community-building objective as much as it is development planning.
The basic concept:

• New development will intensify demands on limited open spaces, community facilities and services, street network and transit, etc

• A comprehensive public benefits package will address these public needs and demands.

• Needs Assessment: Analysis to measure each neighborhood’s needs for various improvements.

• Public Benefits Program: Plan to finance, develop and implement the required improvements.
  - Public Improvements Program
  - Funding Strategy
  - Implementation Plan
  - Monitoring and Reporting
The basic Public Benefits model
(Planning Department presentation to Planning Commission)

But in fact it’s not quite that simple…. 
Woah, this is complicated....

"Public Benefits" Process & Parts

Needs Analysis (Factors + Qualitative) → Public Benefits “Package”

Affordable Housing
Open Space / Parks
Recreation Facilities
Library Materials
Child Care Facilities
Streetcape
Infrastructure
Transit Infrastructure
Bike Facilities
Ped Amenities
Community Service
Schools
Transit Service
Preservation
Neighborhood Retail
Workforce Development
Business Services
(Maintenance & Ops)

Fractional Shares (Factors: Policy, Technical, Nexus)

Revenue Sources
Baseline impact fee
Bonus / "spawning" fee
Tax Increment
General Fund dedications
Assessment Districts
Giants & Props

Non-Revenue Sources
Zoning Requirements
Project Conditions

Plan Horizon
15 +/- Years

Implementation Strategy
- Inter-Agency Coordination
- Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
- Annual Expenditure Plans

Monitoring & Reporting
- BOS Hearings
- "Lessons Learned" for Planning Department

Woah, this is complicated....
Let’s break it down
Needs Analysis
“Needs”= Analysis to measure the neighborhood’s needs for improvements

Existing needs (“deficiencies”)

+ 

Needs created by or exacerbated by new development

[Extrapolated from projected development scenario (ie, from zoning plan)]
Initial quantitative “Needs Assessment” of *current* conditions already done for Western SoMa
Appendix B: Western SOMA

This appendix describes the existing conditions and current needs in the Western SOMA neighborhood. Figures in the main report display the boundaries of this neighborhood, labeled Western SOMA Additional Area. Seifel did not project future needs for this neighborhood because it is not included in the Planning Department’s Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning study area.

Appendix Table B-1 summarizes the assessment of existing conditions and current needs presented in this appendix. All category definitions are identical to those in the main text.

A. Open Space, Parks and Recreational Facilities
- Open Space and Parks—Citywide—Need factor: 4.5 acres/1,000 residents
  No citywide open space currently exists within Western SOMA. However, sufficient amounts of citywide open space are accessible to neighborhood residents. The current citywide open space provision is a ratio of approximately 1.7 acres per 1,000 residents.
- Open Space and Parks—District, Neighborhood and Subneighborhood—Need factor: one acre/1,000 residents
  Western SOMA contains one subneighborhood park of 0.23 acres. Large portions of the neighborhood lack access to neighborhood and/or subneighborhood open space (Figure V-1).
- Recreational Facilities—Citywide provision of 21.58 square feet/resident
  No recreational facilities currently exist within Western SOMA. Based on current population, the existing need for recreational facilities in Western SOMA is 95,000 square feet.

B. Community Facilities and Services
- Education—Need factor: Based on desired number of students per school type in San Francisco
  No schools are currently located in the Western SOMA neighborhood. As such, Seifel was unable to calculate the existing surplus or deficit in the schools capacity. However, given that surplus capacity currently exists in the nearby Eastern Neighborhoods, education needs in Western SOMA are likely currently fulfilled.
- Public Libraries—Facilities—Need factor: Library department does not indicate need for new library branches
  Two libraries serve Western SOMA: the Main Library and the Mission Bay Branch (Figure V-5). Library service is sufficient in the neighborhood.
- Police—Facilities—Need factor: Police department does not indicate need
  The SFPD’s Southern Station is located within the Western SOMA neighborhood boundary (Figure V-6). The new station in Mission Bay will serve Western SOMA residents once SFPD relocates Southern Station to Mission Bay.

C. Neighborhood Serving Businesses—No standard need factors

Anecdotal evidence suggests that neighborhood serving business are lacking in Western SOMA, but the Planning Department does not have information on the current number and square footage of neighborhood serving businesses in the area.

D. Housing
- Affordable Housing Needs—Need factor: 64% of new production is affordable
  ABAG estimates that 64 percent of new housing production in San Francisco will need to be affordable to low and moderate income households, as indicated in the Haurath Socioeconomic Impact Analysis. Based on historical affordable housing production in the City, Seifel estimates that the City of San Francisco will produce about 25 percent of new housing affordable to low and moderate income households. This estimate is based on a combination of the City’s inclusionary housing program and non-profit housing development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Categories</th>
<th>Need Factor</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Current Demand/Need</th>
<th>Existing Need (Surplus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space &amp; Parks - Citywide*</td>
<td>4.5 acres/1,000 residents</td>
<td>4.772 acres</td>
<td>756,967 residents</td>
<td>(1,366) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space &amp; Parks - District, Neighborhood &amp; Subneighborhood</td>
<td>1.0 acres/1,000 residents</td>
<td>0.23 acres</td>
<td>Based on Geography</td>
<td>See Figure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space &amp; Parks (Operating Costs)</td>
<td>6170 $/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities (OM)</td>
<td>21.58 SF/resident</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>4,425 residents</td>
<td>95,492 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities (Operating Costs)</td>
<td>0.254 $/SF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Schools)*</td>
<td>0.317 students/housing unit</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td>0.102 students/housing unit</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6-8)</td>
<td>0.089 students/housing unit</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (K-5)</td>
<td>0.146 students/housing unit</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 student capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td>1,611 students/school</td>
<td>0 schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6-8)</td>
<td>1,389 students/school</td>
<td>0 schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (K-5)</td>
<td>656 students/school</td>
<td>0 schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries (Facilities)</td>
<td>No standard need factor, no additional facilities anticipated to be needed</td>
<td>0 libraries</td>
<td>Based on Geography</td>
<td>0 libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries (Materials)</td>
<td>$74 fe/ resident</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4,425 residents</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police (Facilities)</td>
<td>No standard need factor, no additional facilities anticipated to be needed</td>
<td>1 stations</td>
<td>Based on Geography</td>
<td>0 stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police (Equipment)</td>
<td>0.77 squad cars/1,000 residents</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>4,425 residents</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire§</td>
<td>1/2 mile service area</td>
<td>4 stations</td>
<td>Based on response time</td>
<td>0 stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>0.03 centers/1,000 residents</td>
<td>0 centers</td>
<td>4,425 residents</td>
<td>0.1 centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service Agencies</td>
<td>0.06 centers/1,000 residents</td>
<td>3 centers</td>
<td>4,425 residents</td>
<td>(2.7) centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care§</td>
<td>52.7 spaces/1,000 residents; 22.4 spaces/1,000 workers</td>
<td>351 spaces</td>
<td>785 spaces</td>
<td>434 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants (0 to 24 months)</td>
<td>3.3 spaces/1,000 residents; 5.6 spaces/1,000 workers</td>
<td>58 spaces</td>
<td>158 spaces</td>
<td>100 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School (2 to 5 years)</td>
<td>19.2 spaces/1,000 residents; 16.8 spaces/1,000 workers</td>
<td>233 spaces</td>
<td>514 spaces</td>
<td>281 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Aged (6 to 13 years)</td>
<td>30.1 spaces/1,000 residents; 0 spaces/1,000 workers</td>
<td>60 spaces</td>
<td>113 spaces</td>
<td>53 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Stores</td>
<td>1.3 SF/housing units</td>
<td>Anecdotal evidence of lack of neighborhood serving businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>8.1 SF/housing units</td>
<td>Anecdotal evidence of lack of neighborhood serving businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Service Restaurants</td>
<td>5.8 SF/housing units</td>
<td>Anecdotal evidence of lack of neighborhood serving businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Service Restaurants</td>
<td>4.0 SF/housing units</td>
<td>Anecdotal evidence of lack of neighborhood serving businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>2.5 SF/housing units</td>
<td>Anecdotal evidence of lack of neighborhood serving businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Neighborhood Serving Retail</td>
<td>1.3 SF/housing units</td>
<td>Anecdotal evidence of lack of neighborhood serving businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing needs</td>
<td>0.64 affordable units/total units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,215 total units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DETERMINING NEEDS -- QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

### Existing Neighborhood Goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Categories</th>
<th>Existing Need (Surplus)</th>
<th>Future Conditions Needed</th>
<th>Need Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space, Parks and Rec Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities sufficient to support existing and projected population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Open Space &amp; Parks</td>
<td>(1,366) acres</td>
<td>18.9 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Open Space &amp; Pks</td>
<td>2.3 acres</td>
<td>4.2 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space &amp; Parks Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,908 annl labor cost</td>
<td>30% of 1 Gardener (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Rec Facilities</td>
<td>126,060 SF</td>
<td>90,614 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Staffed</td>
<td>$23,008 annl labor cost</td>
<td>30% of 1 Custodian (annual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impacts From New Housing:

**TOTAL NEED**

Note: Western SoMa future conditions needs still to be determined, based on zoning plan….
“Needs Assessments” have tended to be quantitative/factors-driven
➢ end result is emphasis on ‘bricks and mortar’ public benefits

Can complement assessment with other methods of analyzing needs….

DETERMINING NEEDS – Qualitative Analysis?
For example, for Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas:

• Feedback at Public Workshops
  – East SoMa Workshops in October 2006, February 2007
  – Mission Workshops in November 2006, March 2007
  – Showplace Square/Potrero Workshops in December 2006
  – Community Groups Meetings in September 2006, November 2006

• Office Hours
  – Throughout Spring/Summer 2007 for each neighborhood

• Feedback Sheet
  – Distributed at Mission and E SoMa workshops to solicit independent feedback on affordable housing, public benefits
DETERMINING NEEDS -- “Healthy Development” Analysis?

Western SoMa plan could also utilize DPH’s “Healthy Development Management Tool” to analyze community needs.

THE ANALYTICAL METHOD(S) FOR DETERMINING PUBLIC BENEFITS FOR EXISTING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IS UP TO THE TASK FORCE.
Assessing the Community’s Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Need</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>• 5.5 acres per 1000 residents Citywide</td>
<td>• More open space on Folsom fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 acre per 1000 residents within a 10 minute walk of every home</td>
<td>• Look at 5th/Clementina, City L-shaped impound parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greyline bus parcel is possible open space site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipino Recreation Center · need open space at this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More community gardens like Howard &amp; Ross St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More pocket parks in residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>• 21.5 square feet of neighborhood facilities per resident</td>
<td>• Include recreation uses i.e. soccer fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Multi-use community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth facilities, particularly for youths over 13, needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Methods:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By The Numbers:   On The Ground:   Other Methods:
Public Benefits “Package”

Needs Analysis (Factors + Qualitative)

Public Benefits “Package”

Revenue Sources
- Baseline Impact fee
- Bonus / "upzoning" fee
- Tax Increment
- General Fund dedications
- Assessment Districts
- Grants & Props

 Fractional Shares
- General Fund / Trust Fund

Non-Revenue Sources
- Zoning Requirements
- Project Conditions

Plan Adoption

Plan Horizon
15 +/- Years

Implementation Strategy
- Inter-Agency Coordination
- Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
- Annual Expenditure Plans

Monitoring & Reporting
- BOS Hearings
- "Lessons Learned" for Planning Department

Neighborhood Plan
Public Benefits “Package” is based on the Community Needs Analysis

- The package drives the overall need for funding and for implementation mechanisms

- Different public benefits lend themselves to different sources of revenue and different processes for implementation

- Level of specificity of PBs projects in the Neighborhood Plan’s “program document” may vary
  - Some can be detailed and ready for quick implementation
  - Others may require subsequent design and operational specifications
  - Some may even require additional environmental review to implement

- But important to remember that Public Benefits as a component of the Neighborhood Plan is a “Package” of long term community needs, not just goodies that development fees can pay for
Eastern Neighborhoods Proposal (so far)

• Open Space Improvements
• Transit and Transportation Improvements
• Community Facilities and Services
  – Child Care
  – Library Services and Materials
  – Human Services, Health Care and Art & Cultural Facilities
• PDR, Local and Neighborhood Serving Businesses
• Affordable Housing
Revenue Sources + fractional shares ("nexus")
FUNDING STRATEGY
Paying for COMMUNITY NEEDS

• Development Impact Fees
• Dedicated Tax Revenues
• Assessment Districts
• Grants and Bonds

Each revenue source has opportunities and constraints in how it can be used towards the Public Benefits package

→ policy priorities, technical/logistical pragmatics, “nexus” issues
FUNDING PUBLIC BENEFITS – DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

A mechanism to capture value added through planning and rezoning

Plan Offers Benefits to Developers:
1. CEQA tiering
2. Plan investment/improvements
3. Removal of conditional use
4. Removal of density limits
5. Height increases
Constraints on development impact fees

Lawyers interpreting city-imposed development fees through restrictions of “State Mitigation Act”

- Can only be used to finance impacts caused by new development
- Can only be used to finance capital costs
- Requires nexus analysis to demonstrate impact being addressed by fee
Constraints on development impact fees

City also evaluating *feasibility* of different levels of impact fees as financial “burden” on development

- “Sensitivity” analysis for fees may be driving factor rather than legal “nexus”, as studies seem to be showing greater levels of impact than development alone can shoulder…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Site 1</th>
<th>Example Site 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>41,994 SF or 0.96 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusionary Housing</strong></td>
<td>15% Onsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>M-1 to MUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>50 to 55 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units</strong></td>
<td>70 to 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>1 to .75 Space/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EN Public Benefit Fund</strong></td>
<td>$15/NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Site Value</strong></td>
<td>$9.8M to $12.0-12.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tiered Development Impact Fees

- Assessed on net new square feet where additional development potential is granted
- Tiered fee linked to degree of added development value
- Can be fee or other exaction (e.g., “in-kind” provision of public benefits

- Assessed on all net new square feet
- Rates vary based on impact of Residential, Commercial, & PDR
- Can be structured to incentivize reuse of vacant sites
“Large Sites” – unique opportunities for Development Impact Fees?

• Opportunity for “in kind” on-site improvements to satisfy public benefits requirements?
  such as
  ▪ Streetscape improvements
  ▪ Dedication of open space
  ▪ Provision of public facilities
  ▪ Increase in affordable housing provision
  – eg, a ‘land dedication’ alternative being explored for the other Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas – large development would dedicate a portion of site for affordable housing development

• In a similar way, Western SoMa is exploring other types of dedicated on-site improvements and facilities as public benefits for development potential
FUNDING PUBLIC BENEFITS – DEDICATED TAX REVENUES

• Ideally through “tax increment financing” mechanism to earmark portion of increased property tax revenues from new development in Plan Area
  ➢ Needs to be explicitly built into Neighborhood Plan as funding source
  ➢ TIF requires enabling legislation at state level

• Revenue can be targeted for specific improvements that might otherwise have constraints on using development impact fees
  – Egs, transit, economic development, services, maintenance, etc

• Projections for Eastern N’hoods not including W SoMa, new development could bring up to $172 million to City’s General Fund over 20 years.

(Projected for other Eastern Nhoods plans)
What is the appropriate scale of geography for funding public benefits?

-- ‘system’ approach vs. strictly neighborhood/sub-geography

- Some improvements/PBs are truly local

- Others are sub-area systems improvements (eg, “eastern nhoods”)

- Others may be even broader network improvements
FUNDING PUBLIC BENEFITS – ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS

- Assessment & Finance Districts require 2/3 Vote
- Currently used in retail districts; landscape and lighting districts
- Potential use for ongoing Maintenance: Open space and streetscape maintenance, security, etc
- Qs – is proposing self-taxing districts politically viable? What kinds of specified improvements might be appropriate? How large an area should be in an assessment district (very targeted, or broader)?
FUNDING PUBLIC BENEFITS – GRANTS AND BONDS

- State / Regional / Local Match
  - In-process application for ABAG’s PDA designation

- Grants and Propositions
  - Working with DPW, MTA, Rec/Park and MOH

Also
“Non-revenue” Provision of PUBLIC BENEFITS – Zoning Requirements

- Inclusionary housing
- Street tree planting, landscaping
- Provision of private open space
- “Green” construction
Remember: the overall Funding Strategy is a bundle of revenue sources that in combination will pay for the full “Package” of neighborhood Public Benefits

→ development fees are just one slice of the funding pie

- Development Impact Fees
- Zoning Requirements
  (= developers’ contribution/commitment)
- Dedicated Tax Revenues
- Grants and Bonds
  (= city’s contribution/commitment)
- Assessment Districts
  (= community’s contribution/commitment)
Implementation Strategy
Great, but…
Once the Neighborhood Plan is adopted, how does all this get implemented?

• “Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee” to coordinate responsible and relevant city agencies
  – City planning dept’s key coordinating role—a new ‘mandate’ for the department
    • Need to sort out and establish DCP’s long term staffing role
    • How functional will the new IPIC be over time…?

• “Community Advisory Committee” formation with role in retaining “ownership” and responsibility for facilitating the Plan’s public benefits outcomes (eg, Western SoMa “CAC” could be reconfiguration of Citizens Planning Task Force)
  – What is appropriate role and structure of a CAC?
  – How to ensure a constructive relationship between the IPIC and the CAC?

• Annual expenditure plans
  – Prioritization of PBs projects/programs on yearly basis – set by CAC
  – Dynamic depending on funding streams, synchronization with other projects, level of detail planning, community urgencies, etc etc
  – Expenditure plan developed by IPIC according to priorities
  – Approved by CAC
  – Authorized by BoS
Implementation Strategy – some specifics still being sorted out

• Who collects and monitors proceeds?
  – Revenue sources include impact fees, tax increment, other dedicated sources
  – Collected and administered across multiple plan areas, or just within plan areas?
  – Annual update of fee per CPI index

• How revenue expenditures are directed?
  – Establish criteria for prioritizing projects - plan policies, track growth, etc?
  – Community: CAC/ Advisory Committee
  – City: Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee, Capital Planning Committee

• How to create a flexible Public Benefits fund?
  – Change priorities as needs shift
  – Change funding directives as other sources meet needs
Implementation Strategy – some specifics still being sorted out

Some of these mechanisms and processes for PBs implementation need to be established through the Board of Supervisors
  → Market/Octavia Plan paving the way on much of it, but will likely be some de-bugging needed…

City Must Pursue:
  • Dedicated Revenue mechanism i.e Tax Increment
  • Assessment Districts
  • Small business efforts & outreach
  • Grants coordination office
Monitoring and Reporting

[Diagram showing the process of monitoring and reporting in the context of community planning, with sections for needs analysis, public benefits package, revenue sources, implementation strategy, and plan adoption.]
Learning over time
Public Benefits is still experimental at this point
→ institutionalizing the mechanisms and making it operational will require assessment and corrections as needed

• Institutionalizing “policy memory”…. 

• Building in a monitoring process for expenditures, progress
  – Annual expenditure plan proposed by IPIC and approved by Board
  – Monitoring reports – annually and 5-year (Market/Octavia model)
  – Annual hearing at Planning Commission

• CAC advisory to Board of Supervisors as needed – friendly bird-dogging of city progress
Contact: Peter Cohen
AsianNeighborhoodDesign
Community Planning Program
1021 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
415.575.0423
www.andnet.org

Thanks also to Sarah Dennis
For content materials and collaboration
San Francisco Planning Department