Aaron Goodman

Attn: Scott Sanchez, SF Planning Dept.
1650 Mission St. Suite 400
SF CA 94103-2479

October 12, 2009

RE: Comments Regarding Universal Planning Notification Project Update

Mr. Sanchez

The following issues are related to notification to the community and tenants of Parkmerced in relation to numerous issues I encountered in the notice on projects and issues related to Parkmerced.

a) no public notice was sent to all tenants regarding the SFSU/CSU masterplan
b) no notification was sent to all tenants regarding sales of parcels that consisted of prior amenities to residents of parkmerced.
c) no notification was posted or sent to all tenants regarding the sale of the 700 Font prior SFUSD property. (the notice that was posted was illegible, and not visible from the street, size of text to small, and no notice was sent to residents regarding the sale of a public school site, prior amenity to parkmerced tenants.)
d) no public notices have been sent to the parkmerced community translated, or inclusive of visual diagrams of the size and scope of parkmerced's proposed plans. Only notice of the EIR, that did not include maps, or full-size image of the proposed changes.
e) Scoping meetings held by the SF Planning Dept. on the SFSU Masterplan and Parkmerced "vision" EIR's were both held OFF site which makes it difficult and non-accessible to residents of parkmerced, whom are seniors, and disabled. (restricted comment) on proposals was the end result.
f) The block book notification process is too expensive for residents or neighorhood organizations, and only parcels of note can be BBN listed for our group. There should be a simple site, or district notice level for neighborhood organizations for ALL parcels in a district.
g) We have minority groups and need translated documents which did not occur for the asian, and Russian community now residing in parkmerced.
h) Repeated attempts to get the mayor's office and representatives attending to assist in notification process, and assistance have been met with "no-response".
i) The state CSU/SFSU process, and EIR ignored community input, and attempted to hold meetings outside of parkmerced on properties directly affecting residents of stonestown and parkmerced, on North State Drive, which was HIGHLY inaccessible to community residents of both neighborhoods.
j) State institutions are still responsible for adequate notice, scoping meetings, and translated documents to residents. Notice and meetings occurred during off educational calendar times, nov-dec. rather than when students were on site and able to actively participate. Teacher's at the time of CSU EIR were engaged in negotiations with CSU which prevented public comment on proposal by faculty.
k) Parkmerced vision project continues to implement changes without notification. The "mock-up" areas were not noticed to the community on permits issued for Crespi drive, 3 permits were issued and over 30 units were worked on at one time. An appeal was filed but denied due to lack of impact visually. This is ridiculous as Parkmerced's character and issues of preservation were completely ignored in a district size site. Proper notification must occur, and review of character changing site work, and building finish changes of that scale.
l) Landscape, and open space sites (800 brotherhood) were not noticed to all residents and community members.

m) Open space EIR, and planning update was not adequately noticed to the entire community and its effects on our open space.
n) NC@20 was not noticed or adequately sent to the entire community and its effects on future commercial planning in parkmerced.
o) Housing element EIR and update 2004-2009 was not noticed or adequately informed on its impacts to rental housing and tenants in parkmerced and throughout city.
p) Internet communications cannot supplant notice, and public postings due to many members of the pubic not having internet or computer direct access weekly.
q) Notice regarding projects/proposals must include display's or boards, and visual models to assist in ADA and physical views of proposal size and scope.
r) Adequate information on how projects meet AB-093 are not provided to residents on numerous projects.
s) Public scoping meetings must be held directly at or directly adjacent to project sites, to prevent blocking of access or restricting community involvement.
t) SFMTA TEP project also did not include sufficient information and notice to residents on ALL projects and proposals cummalatively effecting the area.
u) Notice on EIRs and projects were not provided cummaltively effecting the residential tenant area of parkmerced.
v) Cat-Ex. Notice did not include community organizations on the Planning Dept. notice list, there was a separate Cat-Ex. Notification lists of historical organizations, that did not link to the general planning list of organizations. This is completely unacceptable. (Merced branch library.)

Thank you for taking these points/issues related to the UPN process, and attempting to make notification/communication regarding planning processes transparent and involving of community organizations in the future.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman (District 7 Tenant)